

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—OCTOBER, 1870.—No. 3.

ART. I.—THE MODERN NOVEL.

Put Yourself in His Place. BY CHARLES READE. *New York. Harper & Brothers.* 1870.

Man and Wife. BY WILKIE COLLINS. *New York. Harper & Brothers,* 1870.

Lothair. BY THE RIGHT HON. B. DISRAEILI. *New York. D. Appleton & Co.* 1870.

CULTURE produces effects which appear singularly opposite. It makes the mind at once more sensible to the charms of style, and more independent of its attractions. A mastery of the orations of Demosthenes constrains us to more admire his argument than his eloquence. Thus a true Philosophy leads us to value expression, but to place it greatly below thought in the scale of our estimation. With the multitude it is exceedingly different. Ultimately indeed we must always address the common sense of mankind, and yet vain is our appeal unless clothed with some special attractions. Reasoning on the most exciting and important topics is repulsive to the masses unless it comes to them in some pleasing form. Nor is this constitution of the human mind to be disregarded. While it wakes the sneer of the visionary Philosopher, it is turned to ad-

vantage by those who know that to be successful we must be practical. And certainly a vain, and conceited, and unsympathizing scholarship should not in its contempt for mankind pretentiously elevate itself above the wisdom of the Deity who has prepared the entire system of Holy Scripture with a constant reference to that mental constitution we have indicated. In the third verse of the Pentateuch we have recorded not a cold description in scientific terminology, but an utterance of the Creator in the very words which commanded light from darkness. Then how large a portion shapes itself in lively dialogue where patriarchs, prophets, angels, the Almighty are the speakers! Thus when Revelation communicates its account of the formation of worlds, and the commencement of our religion, it studiously avoids the technicality, and the system of science. All the historical portions of the Scriptures, both in the Old Testament and in the New, make their narratives fresh and agreeable by the perpetually recurring dialogue, while the prophetic writings glow with poetic images, and the Psalms united the attractions of metre, and rhythm, and music. Even where the fundamental truths of Theology are developed, the very appearance of the formal and scholastic treatise is avoided. Paul unfolded his matchless arguments in the sprightly epistle, not in the dry essay, or the systematic text-book, and always concluded by descending from the head to the heart in the earnest exhortation, or the affectionate salutation. In every portion of the Scripture too are representations which exceed in their vigorous action the tragedies of *Æschylus* or *Shakspeare*. The whole life of our Saviour from the manger to the cross, and from His grave to His glory takes the shape of a stupendous Drama whose stage is the earth, and whose scene is the Universe, while the last Book of the Bible is a vast Panorama whose images are drawn from every part of Creation and Redemption, Time, and Eternity. And it is this very form in which the Deity has clothed His divine communications that makes the sacred volume the property of humanity, and places it in the home of the laborer as well as the study of the Philosopher.

It is only by keeping in our view this constitution of the mind regarded thus by its Maker that we can properly interpret ancient Art and Literature. The carved figures, and gigantic sculptures of Nineveh, and Babylon, and Egypt were the books of the people.

Homer became the idol of the Greek because he wrote in a style fascinating to the Greek. The Athenian was drawn to the Agora both by the beauty of the image and by the grace of the orator; and the Theatre was not only his resort for diversion but for instruction. Attic Philosophy did not scorn the charms of grove or portico. The Grecian games were vast institutions where the circling discus and the whirling chariot prepared for the glowing Poem, and the elegant narrative. Of the Literature of Rome little remains that has not derived immortality from the mere attractiveness of style. Mediævalism produced more than the ponderous scholastic time. Its rude Dramas and matchless Cathedrals alike uttered a language understood by the people. Especially in England, from the earliest periods, did Poetry and Art appeal to the popular heart. From Shakspeare to the present hour the Theatre in Britain and America has been one of the most powerful agencies ever employed to mould the national mind. But for nearly two centuries a new form of instructing humanity has been gradually increasing its influence and significance. Its precursors were, perhaps, the Utopia of More and the Arcadia of Sidney. These were, however, more adapted to the scholar than the people. The simple narrative of Defoe was the first tale producing that universal interest which has since, in repeated instances, been excited by the Modern Novel. Then Richardson, Fielding, Smollet, Sterne, Goldsmith, by all the attractions of style, and character, and incident, in a series of most brilliant creations, showed that a new art had been born into the world. Sir Walter Scott by the marvelous fertility of his genius at last gave the crowning evidence that human nature was stronger than the protests of Divines, or the contempt of Philosophers. To this fact Abbotsford stands an eternal monument of proof. Now not only school-girls and mechanics, but Statesmen and Theologians alike devour the novel.

Such a triumph of Fiction against such opposition from Press and Pulpit must find its explanation in the nature of man. Our age is compelled to accept the fact. Every Sunday-school Library gives evidence that Christianity itself has abandoned many of its old protests, and resorted for the attraction of its youth to tales not always the most refined, or elevated. Nay, not only the Novel, but even the Drama has defenders among men who are not to be charged with either a want of prudence or of piety. Why? Sim-

ply because they come to humanity with an appeal to those very elements implanted by the Creator, and consulted in every dialogue, and narrative, and parable, and allegory, and epistle, and poem, and representation of the Divine Scriptures themselves, and chosen by the wisdom of the Deity to make the Bible the Book of the people. Both the Novel and Drama may be perverted to error and immorality by Satan and his emissaries, as the Divine Word is itself abused, but the principles to which they owe their success are the very principles to which the Sacred Oracles owe their diffusion. It is therefore the policy and the duty of Christianity to seize, to purify, to elevate agencies so vast and so powerful, and employ them in the cause of truth, and for the spread of salvation.

And we may notice in the works whose names have been mentioned at the head of this Article, a purpose of fiction which is fast becoming the characteristic of this age, and which invests it with a new and startling interest. It reminds us in its development of the railroad and the telegraph. When Hero more than two thousand years ago whirled around his tubes by the reactionary power of steam, he never dreamed that in those childish rotations were revolving the future of our world. Nay, how little did even Stephenson imagine when the rocket moved with hissing boiler and sliding piston before the vast excited, astonished, cheering multitude, that in the simple elements of fire and water, so unappreciated, because so universal, slumbered a force which in his very application of it was to change the whole face of society, and affect the entire development of history and influence all the destinies of our race! Morse could not have conceived when he began to experiment merely with common acids, and common metals known even to common laborers, that with such elements he was to invent an instrument which should bridge oceans and cross continents, and by an electric spark make the nations over the earth almost a single community. Now the steam vessel, the railroad and the telegraph are pushing their way into the very heart of even Africa, Asia, and Australia, and placing the most secluded mountain hamlets in instant communication with the great centres of thought and commerce. And when Defoe wrote his simple tale to amuse children and repair his wasted fortunes, he could not have dreamed that in less than two centuries statesmen and philosophers would be employing fiction as the only pos-

sible means of largely reaching and moulding the multitude. Had he imagined that Divines would be found one day preaching sermons, and the next inditing novels, he would have probably coveted exile in the island home of his solitary hero. Yet no man can interpret modern society without recognizing fiction as a fact.

We have noticed a change in the purpose of the novel. For more than a century its aim was almost wholly to please. Sir Walter Scott seems never to have any loftier purpose than the mere charm of his narrative. Dickens and Thackeray unquestionably purposed distinct ends in the correction of social evils, yet these were invariably if not intentionally a secondary consideration. In the interest of the story you usually lost sight of the object of the story. Indeed a novel for a purpose was branded as a species of hybrid monstrosity, which in departing from the genius of the tale, by seeking too much, sacrificed everything. Many critics began to regard it as an axiom, that fiction teaching philosophy was neither philosophy nor fiction, or had necessarily all the dryness of philosophy without any of the interest of fiction. This theory has been disproved. "Put Yourself in his Place" proposes an assault on a vast social abuse. It is not refined in style. It is not elevated in its conception. It is not skillful in its delineation of character. It is not characterized by anything genial in humor, or sparkling in wit. It has no special beauty of description. It never rises in its morality above the principles of a heathen, and only aims to remove the wrong it assails by an appeal to interest and to passion. You arise from its perusal almost with a sense of relief, and without any sense of elevation. But your interest has been excited; you have been whirled away by a certain intensity of thought and boldness of invention which create a spell you cannot resist. Hence the multitude in car and steamboat and hotel, in town and city and country, in farm-house and study and drawing-room—mechanics, tradesmen, misses, collegians, scholars, lawyers, doctors, statesmen, divines everywhere read the volume. The interest is universal, and the profit is enormous. Yet in every part of the work is kept steadily in view a distinct end to be achieved. As you trace the history of a manly genius pursued by coarse workmen intent on his life—as you see him tempted by threatening letters, waylaid by assassins,

exposed to midnight explosions—as you follow him crossed in love, banished his country, and almost compelled to murder, every sympathy of your nature is aroused on the side of merit and courage, and you have an impression of the hatred, the revenge, the tyranny of trade-unions, which dry statistics and unadorned narration could never produce. An agency so lucrative and so powerful cannot be disregarded by the Christian philosopher.

The story of Mr. Collins is in aim similar to that of Mr. Reade, although more refined in treatment. His plot is most intricate, and interesting, and exciting; his style has never any special merit, and his characters evince no special skill. You miss the manly elevation of Scott, the genial sympathies of Dickens, and the critical satire of Thackeray. But you are riveted to the book by the skill and fertility of the invention. Nothing could be more improbable, and nothing could be more readable. Here too on every page is a pervading purpose. Rather we should trace three distinct aims. These are to caricature the British aristocracy, to ridicule British muscularism, and expose the absurdities of the laws of British marriage. The writer unquestionably produces an impression which stamps the *Modern Novel* with a new power as a revolutionary instrument of modern progress.

But it is a chief object of our Article to discuss more particularly a work which emanates from a higher source, moves on a higher plane, and contemplates a higher end. When we pass from Charles Reade or Wilkie Collins to Mr. D'Israeli we enter another atmosphere. Our transition is from the sphere of the sensational novelist to the world of the cultivated, and comprehensive statesman. We place ourselves within the spell not only of the man of genius but of the man of refined tastes and associations. The author of *Lothair* might indeed be chargeable with snobbery if his gift as a writer, his brilliance as an orator, and his ability in the cabinet, did not elevate him above so mean an aspersion. He can confer more on the English aristocracy than the English aristocracy can confer on him. The day may yet come when they will beg his guidance and assistance in defence of their order, and of the throne. But to properly estimate "*Lothair*" we must consider the motive which prompted its production. Its whole interest centres in its intention. Viewed simply as a novel it resembles an orderly garden remarkable for its stately trees, its superb walks,

and brilliant bloom, but where we are oppressed with the extravagance of the labor, and expense bestowed on its culture; or it is like a magnificent palace on which the skill of art has conferred a beauty, and splendor dazzlingly wearisome; or it reminds you of a decorated stage hung with gorgeous paintings where the puppets are in bright colors and flashing jewels, and in every motion exactly obedient to the will of the master. In this point of view it is a sparkling unreality over which the oriental element of Mr. D'Israeli's genius has cast a spell reminding us of those Arabian tales where gold, and diamonds and gardens, and palaces, and marvels are constantly appearing at the touch of an enchanter. Considered merely in the light of a story the style of "Lothair" appears insufferably stiff, and insufferably brilliant, the characters are either vapid, or unnatural, the plot is wholly devoid of interest, and it is only redeemed by flashes of wit, and satire, and the tokens of a genius which does not choose to employ all its resources. And greatly will we mistake if we construe the work as intended to bring ridicule, and contempt on the English nobility as a class. This was plainly the aim of Mr. Wilkie Collins in his "Man and Wife." He represents the Aristocracy as owls in a decayed summer house overrun with creepers, and flying in stupid dismay from the light poured into their darkness by modern improvement. They are typified by Geoffrey Delemayne, a mere muscular brute, incapable of any ambition above the silly applause of titled imbeciles, excited by success in the boat-race, or the foot race,—who sacrifices his friend, violates his most solemn promise, and at last seeks to murder the woman he has betrayed. But Mr. D'Israeli knew better than to indulge in such indiscriminate assault. He had come into close contact with the Earl of Derby, the talented translator of Homer, the unsurpassed debater and leader, and one of the most sturdy specimens of the old English manhood. He knew that in the House of Lords are orators and statesmen whose sagacity and eloquence are not exceeded in the House of Commons. He had seen in the homes of the aristocracy of his country too many proofs of sense, and refinement, and worth and piety to commit so vulgar an error, as that which characterizes novelists whose business is to excite prejudice that they may reap profit. To suppose that the late Premier of Great Britain would blast his own future as a politician, and incur the hatred of the party in which he has won his

triumphs, is absurd. At the same time there is one class of the English nobility as dissolute, as coarse, as contemptible as Mr. Collins could desire, and another class as vapid, and stupid, and pitiable as Mr. Reade could depict. Now Mr. D'Israeli wrote to influence this latter class. He can only be interpreted by constantly having in view this special purpose. Separated from its design "Lothair" is as stiffly artificial, as painfully unreal, as tediously brilliant as it has been frequently described. To understand the subject fully it is necessary to survey the present social, and political, and religious state of continental Europe in general, and of our maternal England in particular.

Old Rome swayed the world for centuries under her Emperors by her soldiers, and new Rome has sought during centuries to sway the world under Popes by her priests. The purple and scarlet of the two dominations have a prophetic resemblance. The declaration of Infallibility which Pius by the aid of his Jesuits has extorted from his council is the logical consummation of a consistent scheme which has been maturing for ages, and at last reached its result after hoary processes of intrigue, and simony, and battle, which have repeatedly deluged Europe with blood and filled it with horror. Opposition to this usurpation has been long detaching itself from the system, and concentrating itself on a person. It now combines all its forces against the Pope. Every revolutionary element on the continent is mingling in the struggle. In one point of view it is a question of Religion, in another of Liberty, and in another of Race. In the first it is a contest of Protestantism against Romanism, in the second a conflict of the people against tyranny, in the third a war of the Saxon against the Latin. It was the German, and the Englishman who stood against the Pope at the Reformation, and it is their descendants now who will yet marshal in both Europe and America in one final and universal battle. Unquestionable Atheists, Infidels, Jews, and even Turks may stand together with Protestant Christianity against this Roman usurpation which is seeking to enslave the world. The tie is not a common opinion, but a common interest and a common peril. The ideal Theodora, a child of genius and of the people, has been chosen by Mr. D'Israeli as the type of this grand united opposition. While British Premier, it became a duty of his position to study this movement practically, in all its phases, and ramifications, and he is doubtless a master of his subject. "Lothair," if it had no other

merit whatever, would be valuable simply for its delineations of the organized powers we have described, which extend themselves like a vast net-work over Europe and America.

But it is more especially in England we discover the clew to a novel which has been so universal in study, and so universal a puzzle. The Anglican church while essentially Catholic, is perfectly Protestant. We will go back for a few moments that we may contemplate her past, and thus seek to understand her present and her future. Removed by the distance of three centuries from a work everywhere impressed on our Liturgy and our Articles, we are forgetting the characteristics of that period which poured its new light over Christendom. It exhibited both thoughtful wisdom and daring courage. It was bold and prudent, radical and conservative, revolutionary and constructive. It is most singularly distinguished in Art, in Science, in Literature, for the tenacity with which it clung to the past, and the heroism with which it changed the present. It recognized those universal truths which the genius and piety of ancient times have clothed in eternal forms of beauty and of power, to live from age to age in the consciousness of mankind, an inspiration and a joy, and an immortality; and which you would no more seek to improve than the face of a star or the glory of the sun. When the awakened sixteenth century brushed the dust from the ancient classics it was not to despise their antiquity, but to study them as models. Recovered statues embodying ideals of womanly grace and manly majesty were not hurled from their pedestals, but made educators in the creation of a modern art. Crumbling architectural ruins were esteemed treasures whose grand suggestions instructed in shaping Christian temples of devotion. Bacon, who revolutionized science, exhibited in every masterly expression of his thoughts his admiration for the Greek and Roman writers. The greatness of a Period absolutely changing all the aspects and relations of philosophy, art, literature, government, religion, was evinced in nothing more than the wisdom with which it venerated ancient truth, and the courage with which it attempted every bold experiment. If continental Europe in some instances departed from these characteristics, they are fully exhibited by our noble English Reformers. They found Christianity overlaid with innumerable excrescences, which, deforming the tree, had not wholly arrested

its vital currents, and hence they sought not to force from the earth its connecting roots, but to tear away unnatural additions which impaired growth and destroyed productiveness. They properly went back for their models to the apostolic age, as exhibiting the truest types of our holy religion, on the principle that those worlds receive the brightest beams which are nearest the sun. In their investigations they found themselves compelled to employ the Church as a witness. Would they settle the canon of Scripture? They must consult the Church, speaking through her venerated primitive writers. Would they determine whether infants are subjects of Baptism? As the Bible ordained nothing with an absolute certainty, they had recourse to the interpretation of the Church expressed in the early fathers. Would they find a warrant for the substitution of the Christian Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath? They consult the Church for authority in a change touching a sacred precept of the moral law. And on the same principles tempted by blind radicalism to set doctrine against government, and make truth everything and form nothing, when they found not an equal precision of ecclesiastical government in the New Testament as in the Old; they interpreted Holy Scripture not only by the Holy Ghost but by the Holy Church, testifying in a long unbroken line of pious, learned and unanimous authors, and affirmed that a constitution established by inspired apostles must be divine, and that three orders of ministry under the Old Dispensation were to be continued by three orders of ministers under the New Dispensation. For a proper interpretation of sacraments, they resorted to the same authority. Hence our historic past. Hence our regard for apostolic example. Hence our veneration for the church as the custodian and witness of the Scripture. Hence our esteem for the great creeds and the Ecumenical councils. Hence our reverence for sacraments. Hence our affection for that Episcopal succession whose living links bind us to the person of Jesus Christ, our Chief, our Divine, our Eternal Bishop. Hence is the fact that we find in our Prayer-book a reproduction of the Apostolic Church as seen everywhere in the pages of the Scriptures and the Fathers. Hence our presentation of those immortal Liturgies whose perfect forms express the consciousness of Christianity, and afford the only basis of its eventual reunion.

But while our Anglican Reformers exhibited their conservative love of the Past, they evinced their boldness in the Present by their resistance of usurped authority unto chains, unto blood, unto fire. They found no trace in the Canonical Scripture, or in the Apostolic church of any supremacy, or any infallibility in any universal Bishop, separated from whose headship was everlasting death. They detected in no author of the first three centuries a single invocation of saint or angel. They discovered no evidence that the sacramental elements were converted by the word of a priest into a divine substance to be first adored, and then offered in sacrifice for the living and the dead, and then received through the lips into the body. They saw no reason to believe that the secrets of the heart should be forced from the tongue into mortal ears under pain of damnation, or that the payment of money should deliver from the punishment of flames. They perceived no chain on the Bible. They found no law substituting the will of man for the will of God. Yet they saw in their own time system on system of mediaeval superstition and idolatry in both the Greek and Latin Churches, piled almost to heaven between the soul and the Saviour, enslaving the individual conscience, debasing the public morals, and retarding the very currents of eternal life. To purify the fountains of truth, to unseal the pages of Scripture, to hurl down an unlawful authority, to restore the Apostolic Church in its purity, its symmetry, its majesty, required a boldness of progressive movement we are beginning to undervalue. The advances of this nineteenth century are not in the face of racks, dungeons, chains, and flames. Life was given for an expurgated Liturgy, and a translated Bible. Modern improvements blessing with comfort, and enervating with luxury, have yet brought no head to the block, or body to the stake.

Now a movement began in England within a half century which sincerely started to revive Catholic Order, but which terminated in principles tending to overthrow Catholic Faith. It gradually assumed greater and greater hostility to the Protestant element in the Anglican Church, many of whose gifted children, logically true to their opinions, were hurried over to Rome. In a few years the doctrinal basis of the proposed Reform was almost wholly abandoned, and every inferior consideration seemed merged in the restoration of Mediæval Ritual, and desire for the reunion of

Christendom even at the sacrifice of every Protestant peculiarity, every Protestant sympathy, and every Protestant association. Can we wonder if under the assumed splendors of the Papacy genius was keen to detect the childishness and hollowness of the imitation? Can we wonder if manliness should suffer emasculation in a position so false and so unnatural? Can we wonder if the poor vulgar and the rich vulgar should be caught by the tinsel glitter of a gaudy Ritualism? Can we wonder if Rome should employ her Priests, knowing Anglican ways, surrounded by Anglican associations, possessing Anglican secrets, to recover her lost dominion in England? Can we wonder if under such advantages she should be fearfully and boastfully successful? She knows and we know how many and how brilliant have been her triumphs. A Protestant may well be startled when he finds what titles, what estates, what numbers have passed from the ranks of the British nobility under the banner of the Pope. An English pervert has been the most tireless advocate of the monstrous dogma of Infallibility.

Now it has not been the sturdy sons and daughters of the Aristocracy which have made changes so sickly and so alien. It is only the weak and silly flies which become caught in the nets of the spider. Mr. Disraeli has studied this class with every possible advantage. Against these his arrows are directed. He read the arts of Rome in entrapping vapid lords, and stupid ladies into reverence for Cardinals and obeisance to Popes, and he has simply exposed Jesuitical trickery in a way such people could understand. That he has successfully accomplished his task is proved by the way his satire is resented. If his characters are superficial, it is because their representatives are superficial. If conversations are vapid in the book, it is because they are vapid at the dinner table, and in the drawing-room, and on the croquet-lawn. If the deeper passions are not stirred, it is because there were no deeper passions to stir. If arguments are not employed, it is because there were no brains to comprehend arguments. If puppets in flashing splendor move stupidly through the volume, it is because puppets in flashing splendors move stupidly through the palace. If Lothair, a half educated Englishman, who would not complete his Oxford course, takes the hue of every society into which he may come, and falls in love with every pretty woman he meets, and is only saved from Radicalism, or from Romanism, by happening at last to be-

come engaged to the splendid daughter of a Duke, it is because there are some just such simple fledglings among the British Aristocracy, who yet as a class, compare in manliness, and culture, with any other body of men in the world. We can imagine as the old Statesman sat at his desk creating so many vapidities, and unmasking the tricks of Rome, he must have often laid down his pen to smile at the truthfulness of his own pictures. Possibly in no other imaginable way could his end be so perfectly reached as by his novel. A formal treatise would have had few readers. "Lothair" is devoured by the whole world. Two persons have most felt the blow because most injured by its descent—Cardinal Manning, and his infallible Holiness. We only wish the same work could be accomplished in America with the same success. We have youth here fascinated with the painted charms of the Babylonish woman, and who long to kiss her lips, and embrace her person.

Before parting with our subject we will venture a remark. This is an age of action, but not an age of refinement. Liberties are tolerated in society which would once have been branded crimes. A gentleman may escort a lady in public while puffing his cigar, and propose while lighting his pipe under a cloud of tobacco smoke. Not only have manners roughened, but literature has become less refined. Where is the delicacy of Scott? Where is the sensitiveness of Irving? Where is the gallantry of Cooper? Slang has possessed our dailies. Slang has invaded our weeklies. Slang has reached our monthlies. Slang has forced its way even into our quarterlies. In essay, and novel, and treatise, and sermon we find slang. With slang we fight, with slang we make love, and sometimes even with slang we die. Slang is tolerated in Church periodicals which a few years since would have been banished from a country newspaper. Slang is dash. Slang is wit. Slang is progress. Slang is success. Slang is almost piety. In one particular Mr. D'Israeli has made a mistake avoided by Mr. Reade, and by Mr. Collins. He has used no slang. Henceforth he must take the reproach of being a gentleman—suspiciously "*respectable*."

ART. II.—PROFESSOR GEORGE WILSON.

Memoir of George Wilson, M. D. F. R. S. E. Regius Professor of Technology in the University of Edinburgh and Director of the Industrial Museum of Scotland. By his Sister, Jessie Aitken Wilson. 8vo. pp. 544. Edinburgh: Edmonson & Douglas, 1860.

Memoir of Edward Forbes, F. R. S. Late Regius Professor of Natural History in the University of Edinburgh. By George Wilson and Archibald Geikie. 8vo. pp. 599. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1861.

Religio Chemici; Essays. By GEORGE WILSON. small 8vo. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1861.

Counsels of an Invalid, Letters on Religious Subjects. By GEORGE WILSON. 16mo. pp. 260. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1862.

The Five Gateways of Knowledge. By GEORGE WILSON. 16mo. pp. 104. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1861.

The Progress of the Telegraph. By GEORGE WILSON. 16mo. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1861.

WE desire to bring before our readers some account of a recent Scotch chemist and physicist, a man whose name is well known in scientific circles and whose claims upon our notice are somewhat peculiar. Ten years have passed away since George Wilson died. His writings have now been published; and we have the opportunity in what is printed and known to give some impartial account of his career. The studies to which he chiefly gave himself, chemistry and its allied subjects, have advanced greatly since his death, and in some sense he was rather a pioneer in certain branches of research and applied science. We have only to look through the current numbers of that busy, ably conducted scientific weekly, *Nature*, to see how the subjects to which Professor Wilson gave his life as a Lecturer on Technology, have gained in importance and general interest. The time has come when our scientific philosophers are all duly honored, and when elaborate research in the more intricate departments of science is felt to bring substantial advantage to the public. The natural philosopher is no longer an alchemist trying impossible problems in his laboratory, but

rather a man whose speculations do not go far from realities and whose studies have a practical bearing upon matters of every-day interest. Such men were Wilson and Forbes and Faraday.

George Wilson was born in Edinburgh, February 21st, 1818,—“so small a baby that baby garments had to be made expressly for him,”—of parents in comfortable circumstances and good position. His mother was “regarded by all who knew her as a woman of rare natural gifts, who zealously fostered in her children the love of knowledge which they inherited.” He was a twin brother, and to this was attributed in part the “wonderful power of attaching himself and being personally loved, which was one of his strongest as it was one of his most winning powers.” It was the custom of his mother to pay each night a visit to the little cot of her twin boys and repeat over them Jacob’s blessing, “The God which fed me all my life long, unto this day, the Angel that redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” So fascinating was this that George used to pretend to be asleep when his mother came, that he might enjoy it to the full. His nurse said in regard to his fondness for books, “Oh, as for George he was aye to be seen in a corner, wi’ a book as big’s himsel’.” He often told in after life, with glee how his mother, remarking his diligent study of Brown’s ‘Dictionary of the Bible,’ at last, after silent rejoicings, expressed to him her satisfaction at his choice. “Oh mother,” was the reply, looking up with a bright face, “I am making a list of the precious stones.” Again he said to a lady friend, “Much of my delight as a child arose out of natural history. It gives food to the imagination, and tempers the fairy books, of which too many cannot be given to children.” While pursuing his studies at the Edinburgh High School, with his brother, Daniel Wilson,* now Professor of English Literature in University College, Toronto, Canada, they used to improve their weekly and vacation holidays in rambles over the adjoining country, visiting mines, gathering specimens in botany, geology and natural history, as a pastime. Once when they were eleven years old, George went by canal boat to Glasgow. The way he conducted himself on board showed a striking feature of his later life, his unusual power of gaining friends and acquiring information: “George placed him-

* The author of the recent and best Life of the Poet Chatterton.

self side by side with the greatest person on board (the captain) and plied him with question after question till the moment he left the boat. Before leaving, he very politely went up to the captain and mate, and thanked them heartily for their attention and information. They both said they had never seen such a boy." "The key," a friend remarked, "to Mrs. Wilson's success in the education of her family was the love that she fostered among them, and the free discussion that she encouraged, she herself taking a part in all their pursuits and becoming young again for their sakes."

When only fourteen years old the question of a profession for George came up in the family circle, and following his own inclination, the boy selected that of a physician, and was soon bound out for a four years' apprenticeship in the Laboratory of the Royal Infirmary at Edinburgh. At the same time he was attending lectures on natural philosophy, and chemistry and anatomy, and was pursuing a partial course at the University. In his sixteenth year, the British Association held its first meeting in Edinburgh, and was an object of great interest to him, giving shape and consistency to many vague longings after scientific occupation and success in what so soon became the favorite pursuits of his life. During these years at the Infirmary and in the University, he was also widening his knowledge of literature. Among the books which he read with particular profit were De Quincey's *Confessions of an Opium-Eater*, Bulwer's *Novels*, and Sir Thomas Brown's *Works*. But the larger fruit of these days was the acquisition of scientific knowledge from every available source, and at that time these sources were only scanty. Some of the sciences were in their infancy, the microscope was comparatively unknown, and the lectures upon the different branches of study were meagre accounts of previous investigations.

The next step was to enter the laboratory of Dr. Christison as assistant. Here began his chemical studies on a larger scale. He describes himself in a letter to a friend as "buried in the difficulties of several of the physical sciences, changing from pharmacy to chemistry, from chemistry to physiology, or taking as refreshment the subtleties of logic or the elegancies of rhetoric." In the winter of 1837-38, when nineteen years of age he delivered a course of lectures in his father's house on the Chemistry of Nature

to an audience of persons a year or two older than himself. Thus he began almost unconsciously the professional career in which he so much excelled, that of a lecturer on physical science. Another side of his life at this time appears in an extract from a letter to his brother Daniel, then living in London: "How I have wished to be beside you when reading Lamb's letters, which, after reading all the reviews on them, I got hold of in reality last week. They are most exquisite. I have laughed and giggled to myself over my solitary cup and wished I had been near to read them to you, and have a sympathizing agreement in praising them. Many of them, I think, far excel his essays. The India House and the Temple are now hallowed in my eyes, and if ever in London, I shall take care to travel to them." In another letter to the same brother he speaks of that religious use of natural science which he did so much to promote: "I have no altar to kneel at but my own bedside, where I have often prayed to God for you, but there I have prayed for success in my endeavors and *there*, should God grant me the honor of going deeper into His laws than others, I would pour out my sincere thanks and gratitude." He is now deeply engaged in a series of experiments on bromine, though yet a youth under twenty, and of these he says: "My only hope, and it is a feeble one, of getting on as a Chemist is to succeed in some project which shall convince unwilling friends that I have some chance of success in such a profession, and this I must do before I pass as physician, for *that* consummated I must at once begin for myself in some capacity." Again he is studying geology, but is miserable "from want of my laboratory and means to try, by the test of experiments the projects of my brain." In the laboratory, he says, "I must have no one overlooking, even kindly."

He next went to London and became an assistant in the laboratory of Prof. Graham without a salary. Medicine was less attractive than before. He attempted a little practice before he left home and came to this decision: "I was never made to be a physician." Prof. Graham was then Professor of Chemistry in University College, and no place in England presented a better opportunity for acquiring the knowledge of analysis and the other branches of chemistry. Among the students at that time was Dr. Livingstone, the African explorer, with whom young Wilson became intimate.

Here he prepared his first Thesis on "The Existence of Haloid Salts of the Electro-Negative Metals in Solution." The advantages of Prof. Graham's laboratory were not so great as he expected, but he gained other important benefits during his stay in London, and among the chief of these was his introduction to Faraday, and his attending one of his brief courses of Lectures on Electricity at the Royal Institution. The subject and the lecturer alike furnished a rich treat to the young chemist. Faraday delighted him in all ways; a self-made man, and yet with a manner so modest and a bearing so kindly to the eager inquiring youth; and the lectures were a pleasure of the highest kind and full of profit to him afterwards in various ways. Soon after, he went home and passed his examination for a medical degree, a necessary step even in his own cherished purpose of becoming a lecturer upon chemistry.

The plan of a young man, now twenty-one, and in the full flush of abounding promise is "to appear as a lecturer on some provincial arena in the winter." Within a month after receiving his diploma he attended the British Association convened at Birmingham in company with his friend and fellow-graduate, Samuel Brown. He next wanders to the great metropolis and seeks out Faraday who "showed me his whole laboratory with labors going on, and talked frankly and kindly, but to the usual question of something to do gave the usual round O answer. Returning home, he joined the "Brotherhood of Truth," a society founded by the late Edward Forbes when a student at the University, and numbering during the lifetime of these men many of the leaders in the scientific circles of Great Britain. This is the period of looking for something to do; and every straw is eagerly caught at. He soon became President of the Physical Society, which brought him before the public, and says of himself, "There is some prospect afar off, but not uncertain, of lecturing being got, so that I work hopefully onwards." In the beginning of the year 1840 a bright spot becomes visible in the horizon. There was an opportunity to teach chemistry in Edinburgh the next winter. This opening was a license as a lecturer on chemistry from the Royal College of Surgeons, and though nameless and with little influence no other could have offered similar advantages. It introduced him to the

notice of the University, and was a place where any deficiencies would not be made too prominent.

For his lectures he made elaborate preparation, and this was the secret in fact of that easy use of varied information which marked all his public performances. In June, 1840, he says, "I work steadily at my lectures, writing and reading often for eight or ten hours a day. I find that the undertaking is a more serious one than it seemed at first. But I don't flinch and hope to get on bravely." At the same time in the society of Edward Forbes, John Cairns, Sir William Hamilton and many lesser lights he was fast ripening into literary manhood. He at once became a favorite lecturer, though now only twenty-two. He delighted to impart to others the knowledge he possessed, and by the wonderful law of sympathy this delight communicated itself to his audience. While unfolding with patient care the deeper laws of his favorite science, flashes of wit and fancy lighted up the subject. A sweet voice added to the charm; and foreign students with an imperfect knowledge of English were often advised to attend him in preference to other teachers as being more easily followed. Prof. Forbes said in 1844, "Wilson is one of the best lecturers I ever heard, reminding me more of the French school than our humdrum English, and is a man of high literary taste and great general knowledge." A letter written in March, 1842, discloses the young chemist in the full glow of work: "I propose in summer to begin a special course, addressed chiefly to the senior students and medical men, on animal chemistry, a subject of great importance, at which I have been diligently laboring all the winter. I shall bring before them a new and highly important branch of chemistry never properly studied in this country. The medical men themselves are very anxious about it, and it was the solicitation of others that first urged me to it. My own tastes lead me to other departments, but poverty precludes their prosecution at present, and this is really as rich and noble a field as any, and grows every day more interesting to me." Dr. John Cairns said of his introductory lecture: "I never admired anything more than his firmness in writing down the agonies of pain. I heard his opening lecture on animal chemistry with great interest and instruction. He has a very fine and penetrating mind, and is marked out for eminence. We are getting wonderfully intimate, and I enjoy no-

body's society more." Thus in his native city, though yet in a very humble way and a mere youth in years, had George Wilson already asserted the genius that was in him and marked out for himself the path by which he was to achieve distinction.

We turn now to another phase of his life. About the time he became a public lecturer, he began to suffer from ill health. In March, 1842, he says of himself, "For the last five weeks I have not had a night's unbroken sleep through pain, and even the repose, such as it was, has been procured only by the nightly use of morphine. Even so late as a week ago, I had to stop in the middle of a lecture overcome with a severe paroxysm, and go straight home." Yet in such health he was speaking four hours *per diem*, with an audience overflowing, crammed to the door, and scarcely even standing room to be had, and says of himself, "That nature which has given horns to bulls has given me a tongue which nothing but death can keep from wagging." He was suffering from rheumatism, from very weak eyes; and an abscess was gathering about the heel of his foot, where some time before there had been a sprain, in which he had taken cold. He was required to prepare on very short warning, for the loss of a limb by amputation. The only alternative was death; and it was so doubtful whether he would survive the operation that he asked for a week to prepare for death and what lies beyond it. He had always lived a good moral life, but now almost face to face with death, all the great realities of religion came pressing upon him with unwonted force. In regard to this change he himself said, "It pleased God, who speaks to some with the still small voice of gentle persuasion, to address me in the whirlwind and the storm, and to vouchsafe me, in the prospect of sore trial, a calmness, even a serenity and patience which could have been supplied me from no other source." This serenity and patience did not pass away with the partial recovery of health, but became habitual to him as long as he lived. We now enter upon the stage of his life when he lived like a dying man. Not long after the amputation, he discovered that his lungs were diseased, and henceforth existence was to him a continual struggle, the question being how with a very limited amount of physical power he could accomplish the purposes of an unusually active and energetic mind. In fact, the very lesson of such a notice as we are here giving of Prof. Wilson's life is the way in

which he performed his daily tasks and made his life cheerful and useful, though himself suffering from almost constant pain. Such a record of good done for man, amid so much personal trial, we have very seldom known; and this now marked feature of his character will appear in strong relief as we give further glimpses from the very ample Memoir before us.

When the winter of 1842-43 opened upon him, his professional duties were increased by his appointment as lecturer on Chemistry to the Edinburgh Veterinary College, and by a similar appointment to the School of Arts. A course of lectures to young ladies at the Scotch Institution on Saturdays was also begun in November, so that altogether he was delivering ten lectures a week. To his sister he writes: "You will not suspect me of vanity, if I tell you of a thing or two about my lectures. I have twenty students at my 10 A. M. medical class; forty at my twelve o'clock (three days a week) veterinary class; some hundred young ladies at the Scottish Institution; and some two hundred stout fellows at the School of Arts." Of the latter class, which was his favorite, he said: "My great pleasure in it is lecturing to the working people, to whom I may do intellectual and moral service." His sister says, "His lectures were usually delivered from notes, and a few of those written for this audience, and used for no other, remain as evidence that some of the finest specimens of his powers as a speaker were elicited by this favorite class. The enthusiasm with which they responded was abundantly proved by the band of chemists which then began to form, many of whom have forsaken all else to prosecute this branch of science, both in its scientific and its practical departments; while it would be vain to attempt a calculation of those whose minds were elevated by its study, pursued after days of toil." One of his pupils comparing these lectures with those subsequently delivered as Professor of Technology in the University said: "There was the same power of riveting the attention of his audience, nay almost fascinating them; the same playful fancy and poetical prose in his prelections; the same Christian Catholicity of heart; the genial sympathy with the 'pursuit of knowledge under difficulties;' the same familiar, homely mode of illustration; the same aptitude in experiment; the same affability to his most humble and obscure student. These qualities combined to render him at once the greatest favorite and

the most efficient teacher among his colleagues at the School of Art."

In the summer of 1844 he was baptized by immersion, "having satisfied myself that it was the scriptural and most ancient method" * * * though "inclining strongly to consider the mode unimportant, and to believe that affusion of water is all that is implied in the idea of baptism." He subsequently united himself with the Congregational Society, under the care of the present popular Dr. W. L. Alexander. In earlier life he had admired the Church above all other religious bodies, even going so far as to say of the London Clergy whom he heard preach, that "in meekness, simplicity, and earnestness of purpose, they cannot well be surpassed by the ministers of any denomination," but there is no evidence that his early baptist training ever broke away enough for his clear understanding of the true principles of the Church. We cannot the less, however, concede to him a very bright and pure Christian example as one of the few scientific men who carried his religion into all his studies, and made them the instruments of setting forth God's goodness and love. No one can read the addresses which now remain and which were first delivered to medical classes on the religious bearings of the medical profession, or call to mind his readiness to give lectures to aid the poor, or struggling home-mission work, or Sunday or apprentice schools; nor can any one look over the delightful *Counsels of an Invalid*, the letters which a sick man wrote to comfort others, sick like himself, without feeling that George Wilson brought down the rich treasures of science to the humblest capacity, and lived not for self alone. A gifted man of letters observed that "few indeed are the sermons which we read that can leave so deep an impression of reverence for Him whose works science interprets as did the simplest of George Wilson's compositions. In listening to Wilson, you not only increased your knowledge, your store of facts, but you were delighted with the beauty and harmony of their relations and interdependence."

These remarks are amply borne out by the very popular little essay, *The Five Gateways of Knowledge*, in which he lectures upon the five senses. An extract where he dwells upon the hand as the organ of touch, gives a good specimen, not only of his

prose style, but of that constant higher suggestion and purpose which runs like a thread of gold through all his writings :

" The hand is emphatically the organ of touch, not merely because the tips of the fingers, besides being richly endowed with those nerves which confer sensitiveness upon the skin of the whole body, possess in addition an unusual supply of certain minute auxiliary bodies called 'tactile corpuscles,' but because the arrangement of the thumb and fingers and the motions of the wrist, elbow and arm, give the hand a power of accommodating itself spontaneously to surfaces, which no other part of the body possess. Moreover, when we speak of the hand as the organ of touch, we do not refer merely to the sensitiveness of the skin of the fingers, but also to that consciousness of pressure upon them in different directions, by means of which we largely judge of form. When a blind man, for example, plays a musical instrument, he is guided in placing his fingers, not merely by the impression made upon the skin of them, but also by impressions conveyed through the skin to those little bundles of flesh called muscles, which move the fingers. Were it possible to deprive the hands of their skin without inflicting pain, we should retain the muscular touch, and with it the power of playing.

" In many respects the organ of touch as embodied in the hand, is the most wonderful of the senses. The organs of the other senses are passive; the organ of touch alone is active. The eye, the ear, and the nostril, stand simply open; light, sound and fragrance enter, and we are compelled to see, to hear, and to smell, but the hand selects what it shall touch and touches what it shall please. It puts away from it the things which it hates, and beckons towards it the things which it desires; unlike the eye, which must often gaze transfixed at horrible sights from which it cannot turn; and the ear, which cannot escape from the torture of discordant sounds; and the nostril, which cannot protect itself from hateful odors.

" Moreover, the hand cares not only for its own wants, but when the other organs of the senses are rendered useless, takes their duties upon it. The hand of the blind man goes with him as an eye through the streets, and safely threads for him all the devious way; it looks for him at the faces of his friends, and tells him whose kindly features are gazing upon him; it peruses books for him, and quickens the long hours by its silent readings. It ministers as willingly to the deaf; and when the tongue is dumb and the ear stopped, its fingers speak eloquently to the eye, and enable it to discharge the unwonted office of a listener.

" The organs of all the other senses also, even in their greatest perfection, are beholden to the hand for the enhancement and the exaltation of their powers. It constructs for the eye a copy of itself, and thus gives it a telescope to range among the stars; and by another copy on a slightly different plan, furnishes it with a microscope, and introduces it into a new world of wonders. It constructs for the ear the instruments by which it is educated, and sounds them in its hearing till its powers are drained to the full. It plucks for the nostril the flower which it longs to smell, and distils for it the fragrance which it covets. As for the tongue, if it had not the hand to

serve it, it might abdicate its throne as the Lord of Taste. In short, the organ of touch is the minister of its sister senses, and without any play of words, is the handmaid of them all.

"And if the hand thus munificently serves the body, not less amply does it give expression to the genius and the wit, the courage and the affection, the will and the power of man. Put a sword into it, and it will fight for him; put a plough into it, and it will till for him; put a harp into it and it will play for him; put a pencil into it and it will paint for him; put a pen into it and it will speak for him, plead for him, pray for him. What will it not do? What has it not done? A steam engine is but a larger hand, made to extend its powers by the little hand of man. An electric telegraph is but a long pen for that little hand to write with. All our huge cannons and other weapons of war, with which we so effectually slay our brethren, are only Cain's hand made bigger and stronger and bloodier. What, moreover, is a ship, a railway, a lighthouse, or a palace—what, indeed, is a whole city, a whole continent of cities, all the cities of the globe, nay, the very globe itself, in so far as man has changed it, but the very work of that giant hand, with which the human race, acting as one mighty man, has executed its will.

"*When I think of all that man and woman's hand had wrought from the day when Eve put forth her erring hand to pluck the fruit of the forbidden tree, to that dark hour when the pierced hands of our Saviour were nailed to the predicted tree of shame, and of all that human hands have done of good and evil since, I lift up my hand and gaze upon it with wonder and with awe."*

You cannot go far in any of Prof. Wilson's writings without coming upon sentences like the last, not even in his purely scientific essays, when a religious use of facts is hardly to be expected; and they show the strong tendency of his mind to utilize and elevate every subject which he took hold of. From *The Progress of the Telegraph* passages similar in the manner of illustration might be taken, but the above is the only passage we have room for as setting forth his prose style; and what a style is this, so clear, so simple, so fresh, so fascinating! We need not wonder that he held audiences as if with a charmed spell when his written or spoken style was in such a vein. It was his purpose in the latter years of his life to write a work which should in some respects be a parallel volume to Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*, and to it he gave the name *Religio Chemici*. This volume of essays was published with such a title after his death, but the essays which make up the work had been mostly written several years before. After reading some of them Lord Jeffrey, who was his intimate friend, wrote: "They give me a very high opinion

not only of Dr. Wilson's talents and learning, but of his taste and power of writing. His severer style is admirable, and nothing can be better than the lucid and energetic brevity with which he abstracts facts and condenses arguments." Those scientific memoirs on Dalton, Cavendish, Wollaston and Boyle, show a range of reading and a power of clear statement not often combined in the treatment of any science. His favorite study was scientific history and biography, and he had it in mind to write the lives of the distinguished chemists of Britain, of which work these memoirs were to form a part; but the design was never fulfilled. Three essays in this volume are respectively on *Chemistry and Natural History*, *The Chemistry of the Stars*, and *Chemical Final Causes*. The first boldly grapples with the difficulty arising from the presence of evil as well as good in the manifestations of a design, and contains a vivid reflection of his own experience of suffering. The next is an endeavor to determine the extent to which we can ascertain the relative difference of chemical composition between the earth and the heavenly bodies. In the third, he attempts to add to the ever-accumulating proofs of design by showing especially that phosphorus, nitrogen and iron, are the best adapted of the known elements for the purposes they are required to fulfill in animal organisms. The whole volume is not only valuable in itself as a contribution to useful speculation and scientific history, but as showing that rare ability as a teacher which is now chiefly the tradition of those who heard his lectures. There is no more attractive or profitable scientific reading than what he has written. A further work in biography was the *Life of Edward Forbes*, only six chapters of which did he live to complete, though the work has been very ably finished by another hand. There is no monograph concerning the Isle of Man, the birthplace of Forbes, which is equal to the first chapter of this memoir, and the work itself as much reveals the genial heart and gay humor of Wilson as the gradual education of a great naturalist. It is one of the happiest specimens of a compact and readable biography of a scientific man which we know of. One would say that Prof. Wilson had taken good, honest Isaac Walton, for his model, and few who take up this memoir will lay it down till they have reached the last page.

But we turn again to the narrative of Wilson's own life. In the

spring of 1846 he gave in addition to his usual and regular courses of lectures, a short course on the "Relation of Physical Science to the doctrines mooted in the *Vestiges of the Natural History of the Creation*," which was largely attended, and which six publishing houses offered to print without delay, but he put them aside till he could divest them of a polemical form, and the leisure never came to give them the proper shape. Speaking to Dr. Cairns of these lectures he said: "I have too much wrought only at science and literature, hoping thereby to secure a position which would enable me to serve Christ effectually. But many things warn me that my life will be a short one, and that what I can do must be done swiftly." This "slight opportunity of doing a little good," however, cost him a severe illness of some months. In 1849 his *Text Book on Chemistry*, a work which in nine years circulated to the extent of 24,000 copies, was prepared for the press by dictation at his summer retreat, whither he had taken himself for the summer, because rheumatism and general feebleness had compelled the abandonment of his spring classes. Idleness was to him an impossibility, and this work was undertaken as the only occupation of which he was then capable. He was quite unable to hold a pen for months, and dictated his pages to his sister, while pacing the room with compressed lips that showed the pain could scarcely be endured, but pain did not stop the work nor interfere in the making of a very useful book. His investigations on *Color Blindness* added as much as anything to his scientific reputation. He demonstrated the fact that very many people are color-blind, and applied his investigations to shipping and railways, and to all kinds of signal telegraphing, in a way to permanently benefit mankind. This was indeed a prominent feature in Prof. Wilson's character, the desire to utilize every subject, and to turn it, if possible, to practical account; and this quality of his mind undoubtedly led to his appointment in 1855 to the then newly-founded Chair of Technology in the University, a post which he held with great credit to himself and with great general usefulness till his death in November, 1859. This Professorship was connected with the office of Director of the Industrial Museum of Scotland, and in both these positions he seemed to have found his proper place. For Wilson did not excel so much as an investigator into the unexplored branches of science as in the illustration and application

of truths and facts already discovered. This chair of Technology led him to make these applications in the medium ground between pure science and industrial pursuits, and at once brought into use his extensive practical knowledge and his peculiar aptness in making it popular. Accordingly he soon made this Chair beneficial to all classes, and especially to those not pursuing full courses of study. The professions represented in his class were those of the "general manufacturer, architect, engineer, farmer, merchant, baker, tanner, sugar-planter, sugar-refiner, teacher, doctor and clergyman, besides young men entered simply as students, but chiefly training for industrial callings." He had about forty students for his first course. His syllabus required three years to go over its contents. At first the branch of teaching was so new as to keep away students, but as the years went on it became the most successful professorship in the University, and acquired almost a European fame. How extensive was the ground which his actions occupied, appears from the following extract from his class syllabus :

"The course was divided into mineral, vegetable, and animal technology. Under the first were included the relation of the atmosphere, the ocean and tributary waters, and the earth to Technology; and among special subjects, fuel, building material, glass and glass-making, pottery, earthenware and porcelain; metalotechny, electrotechny, and magneto-techny. Under the second or vegetable technology, were considered saccharo-amylaceous substances, sugar-making, albuminous substances and fermentation, distillation, wood and wood fibres, textile tissues, bleaching, dyeing, calico-printing, paper-making, scriptorial or graphic industrial arts, caoutchouc, gutta-percha, and the resins, fats and oils. Under the third section, or animal technology, were included the mechanical application and chemical products of bones, ivory, horns, hoofs, tortoise-shell, shells and corals; skins, tanning, fish-scales, hair, fur, wool, bristles, quills and feathers, animal refuse."

Beyond this brief synopsis he was continually branching off into special subjects connected with his general theme, so that his range of topics was almost as unbounded as the general influence of such technics in developing the industrial energies of the people. He said of his course in 1858 :

"I finished, a week ago, my third course on Technology. I have changed the subject each year, and have now completed the round of vegetable, mineral and animal industrialism, and know my ground. There are fearful gaps to fill up and a thousand things to learn, but I have had some of the

same men all the three years, and have interested even soap-makers in soap-making."

In September, 1857, he wrote to his friend, Dr. Gladstone :

"I am rather digesting plans than carrying them out. A President's Address, a Syllabus, three special Lectures on Paper, Pens and Ink, one on Industrial Museums, and a course of prelections on Technology, are at present simmering together in my head like the diversified contents of Meg Merrillies' gipsy camp-kettle. To-morrow, when the new month comes in, I'll begin ladling them off into separate pots and pans, and fall to the process of cooking properly so called. Meanwhile I am chiefly occupied with Forbes' Life and Directorial Correspondence."

Such was one side of his active life ; yet all this time he was in a very low state of health. He said of the following winter :

"That much of it was spent in bed, and much of it in doing work with an effort." At another time he wrote : "I live from day to day, feeling no hold upon life, but happy many times and for long hours, although my temperament is not one which even the choicest mercies could rob of its native inquietude and sensitiveness. But all is well. I have great holes in my heart, and dreary voids in my affections ; but on this side of the grave they cannot be filled, and I will work as hard as I can till the manumission comes."

When the Chair of Technology had been accepted by him, he wrote :

"With unfeigned sincerity I can say that I have rejoiced at the prospect of serving my Saviour more and better through the influence it may give me, and the prayer is often on my lips and oftener in my heart, that I may be made bold and wise enough to confess Him before men. I see so many of my scientific and literary friends devoured by the cares of the world and fretted by its little troubles, that I tremble lest I too become a selfish, scheming worldling."

In 1859 he said :

"The meaning of life, the purpose of God, the worth of this world and the next, have all risen into a prominence which they had not formerly displayed. I was not expecting or seeking this. It came upon me like the wind blowing where it listeth."

And again :

"My physical activities and locomotive powers steadily abridge their circle of energy."

Again he says of the 15th chapter of Corinthians :

"It stirs me like a trump of doom. I cannot read it aloud without finding my voice break down ; all the immortal dead I know seem to gather

about me as its mingled pathos and jubilation, and summons, sound out from its solemn diapason. Tears and confusion and thanksgiving take the place of articulate didactic words, and the image of the heavenly obliterates all else."

This strong religious feeling appears in all his most familiar letters, and amid constant and most pressing occupations; indeed, he lived daily like a dying man, and yet with the most ample enjoyments of life.

The end was now very near. He had not yet reached his forty-second year, but the light of life was burning low in the sockets, and he himself felt that he might be called away at any time. A severe cold taken in the latter part of November 1859 soon developed into pleurisy, and in two or three days the end came, not unlooked for and with his interest in life unabated till the last. "They are not up in the Atomic theory," said the Professor, when his sister attempted to restrain him from overtaxing his strength in delivering his last lecture; and even in his final hours, while Dr. Cairns and other friends conversed with him about the great journey and his sister read to him such passages from Holy Scripture as could comfort a dying man, he still wished the choice things to be read to him from the unfailing *Athenaeum* of the week; and then the end came and the golden bowl was broken, and George Wilson's spirit had gone to another home.

Thus lived and died a man who carried into all the diversified pursuits of an influential calling a pure and holy consecration of his mind's best energies to Christ. He deserves the name of the religious chemist. He imparted to all his work a moral purpose. He paid very little for self. It can be easily seen that such a man would be beloved, and the spontaneous mourning of the whole city of Edinburgh when he died, a thousand persons following his remains to the final home, was a witness to the fact. Wherever he went, he attracted people to him and children especially. Though excused by bodily infirmity from an active share in public affairs, his unconquerable energy triumphed over physical suffering, and he accomplished more than many men who hardly knew the feeling of pain. Though gifted as a literary man and to be remembered as one of the very best expositors of scientific research, though a poet too and a humorist, though very highly gifted in almost every department of mental work to which he

gave his attention, his patient devotion to studies which benefit man, his rare purity and elevation of character, his silent victory over pain and disease, the prevailing tone of religious thought which pervades all, are his highest claims to renown and make him one of the leading scientific lay-preachers of his age. May many another George Wilson be found among those who now give so much thought to physical science.

ART. III.—PAUL AND TERTIUS, OR SCIENCE AND REVELATION.

A TRACT FOR THE TIMES.

WE hope that none of our readers will turn from our Article because of the triteness of the subject we have named at the head of it. Doubtless much has been written and spoken on this subject,—much wisely and well said—some things not so wisely and well. But much remains to be said before the human mind will be satisfied and all dispute, doubt and controversy cease. And we write in the hope that we will be able in the course of our Article to say some things that have not been said before; and above all to say some things which all right-minded persons and all lovers of truth will in the end confess to have been well said. Nay, in the exercise of what may not be regarded as an altogether intolerable self-conceit, we trust that what we have to say may be considered as we have more than truly called it, “A tract for the times”—perhaps even in view of all the circumstances of the case “*the tract for the times*” for all persons who are theologically inclined, whether believably or skeptically so inclined.

We have expressed our belief that not all has been said on the relation of Science to Revelation which the subject admits of—nor yet all that those who are interested in the subject at all, are anxious to hear: *the one thing* that they want to hear and read, has not yet appeared either as written or spoken: for if it had, of course, everybody would be satisfied and there would be no more desire to read or hear on the subject: no more desire even to write or to speak: all would acquiesce in the view presented, and all would be satisfied.

Now, in the outset, let us distinctly note the fact that, beyond all question, there is such a thing as an "*evil heart of unbelief*" in consequence of which there are many who don't want to believe in Revelation, and who therefore will either discover or invent difficulties in the way of belief not easy to remove, because those who feel troubled by such difficulties don't want to have them removed. We believe that these are very few. We have never seen or known *one*—who really wanted to believe in Christianity—accept it as a rule of life and a ground of hope in death, that found any real or serious obstacle in the way of his doing so, in any of the scientific difficulties, whether physical or metaphysical, that any thing calling itself science has ever presented. We say that we have never seen such persons. But we are willing to admit for argument's sake that there may have been such. And herein is the chief difficulty of our subject, to convince those that don't want to be convinced—to cure those who do not want to be well of their disease.

In the next place let us carefully note, that the relations of Science and Revelation, whether of harmony or contradiction, cannot be settled fully, ultimately and satisfactorily, *in the old method at least*, until both Science and Revelation are thoroughly understood and rightly understood. Go back in the history of thought and opinion four or five hundred years, and there was no suspicion of any contrariety. In fact, Physical Science, properly so called, scarcely existed. With the commencement of its culture a new method was introduced and thereafter two methods of opposite characters and diverse tendencies were in use among men: the *theologic* which reasoned from authority, by way of interpretation and dogmatism, and the *scientific* which reasoned by way of observation, and induction and inference. It was not possible in the nature of things that those engaged in these two different methods respectively, should not show each of them a little preference for his own acquired by habit and use—and, a little jealousy of the other. Instead therefore of working in harmony there would be at work a tendency to alienation, a tendency to find and magnify discrepancies, the theologians would denounce the *savans* as skeptic, infidel, &c., &c.; and the men of science would distrust the theologians, regard them as bigots—possibly as hypocritical impostors—and them-

selves become skeptical, unbelieving, and perhaps as the theologians had resorted to excommunication and denunciation,—the skeptics would resort to scoffing and ridicule.

Meanwhile the status of both parties is changing; the men of science have found, and have compelled all men to acknowledge that certain facts contrary to what the theologians had held, are unquestionably true, such as the roundness of the earth and its revolution on its axis, about the sun,—the greater antiquity of the earth than the six thousand years which the theologians—resting as they supposed on revelation—had ascribed to it. And now they came forward with the claim that not only the earth has existed for unaccountable millions of years, but that man has existed on its surface for at least many tens of times the six thousand years that the theologians allow, and as a consequence that the first chapters of Genesis, at least those giving an account of the creation and early condition of men, cannot be accepted as historically true. Will they succeed? We do not propose to answer or discuss that question here at all. But whether they do or do not, will this be the last question of the kind they will raise? Who can tell? Manifestly therefore the relation between Science and Revelation cannot be settled or understood thoroughly and satisfactorily until Science itself shall have completed her list of alleged contradictions to Revelation and—what is more—settled it with herself how she will have these facts regarded—what is in truth her own mind and position in regard to them.

On the other hand Theology has changed its grounds. When Copernicus, Galileo and others insisted that the earth was a revolving globe the Theologians thought that Revelation taught the contrary, and that the point could not be conceded to Science without abandoning the whole ground covered by Revelation and giving up the very foundations of faith and hope. But the scientific fact prevailed, faith and hope are not given up—nor are the arguments in favor of Revelation considered as altogether, or even at all shaken or weakened by the success of science. Theologians however have come to see and confess, what they either did not then think of or would not confess—that the sacred writers were not teaching Astronomy and Physical Geography—but Theology,—"not" as has been said "how the heavens go, but how men may go to heaven." So too with regard to the other fact named.

The *time* of the creation of the earth. When Dr. Chalmers—after the controversy had raged for more or quite a century without abatement or prospect of an end, declared that “the Book of Genesis was not intended to settle the matter of chronology—not to tell men *when* God created the heavens and earth, but the fact that He created them,” he made a concession that Theologians—under the pressure of growing conviction—now become an acknowledged fact that the earth is older than six thousand years, have been glad to acquiesce in, and under shelter of which they have been able to renew, for a time at least successfully, their defence of Revelation as being a credible as well as a credited fact. Shall we be obliged to go one step further and acknowledge that Moses in the first chapters of Genesis did not intend to write the *history* of creation, but rather the *theology* of it? That he aimed not to give us either the chronology or the actual historic facts of the creation and early conditions of the earth and of men upon it, but rather the theological doctrines that it and they *were* created, that man *was* at first sinless and then became a sinner, and the consequence of this change, that God, the Creator, exercises not only a moral government over but also a Father’s love towards man, and that He is a proper object of love, worship and obedience for all mankind? That in fact Moses had no more thought or design of writing *history* in the first part of Genesis than our Lord had of adding to our stores of historic fact, in His parable of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son and the Virgins? The question will startle many; and it ought to do so. But it is a question proposed by many, and one which if the mere claim to the great antiquity of man set forth by the geologists of our day, shall come to be accepted as indisputable fact, must be considered and answered. But all this is merely preliminary to our main purpose, and to show that if Scientific men are not quite prepared yet to show us their *ultimatum*, so on the other hand we, Theologians, must not overlook the fact that we have facts and questions of our own to discuss, consider and settle before we are prepared to exhibit our last word or concession, the statement of our position most favorable to a reconciliation with Science—the position we can occupy so as not to be overcome and overwhelmed with defeat in the controversy now seen and felt by all to be inevitable and immediately impending.

For, be it considered in view of the past, a scientific fact when fairly ascertained and universally accepted as such, is the most controlling thing in the world. All the theories and practices of men must conform to it. Men will not believe Theology if Theology says in this age, as it did three centuries ago, that the earth is flat and stationary, with sun, moon and stars revolving about it daily. Men will not believe Theologians if they insist that the earth has not existed and been inhabited by living creatures, more than any six, or eight, or ten thousand years. Men, sensible men, will indeed be *slow* to believe that *men* have lived on the earth more than six thousand years if Theologians assure them that such is the fact, and that this assurance rests upon Revelation. But men do not, men will not, men cannot resist the advancing discoveries of science. It was more than a century after Galileo, before his theory of the earth's movements was accepted by all, so as to become a part of the common thought of men. Even Milton, in his *Paradise Lost*, found the old theory better for his purposes and not too universally abandoned to be unfit for his use. It was more than one hundred and fifty years after the Italian geologists of Verona—1517—claimed that they had found *fossil* remains which indicated a successive order of creation, and greater antiquity than that commonly assigned by Theologians to the earth's existence, before the doctrine was commonly accepted, or had ceased to be an object of distrust and denunciation with the advocates of Revelation, as against the claims and pretensions of science. And while the advocates and students of science have held many false and absurd theories, which scientific men themselves of their own, or the next age, have refuted, and while they have claimed many facts that have turned out to be no facts, we must remember and consider well and profit by the consideration, too, the following facts: 1. No theory or pretended fact of science has ever been disproved, refuted or abandoned on account of any argument drawn from Theology or Revelation against it, but solely and purely on scientific grounds alone. And 2. When any fact has been established in the common consent and estimation of scientific men, in the department of science to which it pertains, it has soon come to be accepted by all men in all departments of science, and Theologians have found some way of reconciling Revelation with the accepted fact of

science. Of course we do not say that facts of science, or rather phenomena and theories claimed as such, which have been opposed on theological grounds, have not been abandoned as untenable and untrue; but it was not for the theological objections or oppositions that they have been abandoned. They were abandoned for want of scientific support, or on account of opposition of scientific facts; not at all or in any case from the opposition of Theology or Revelation. This statement which we believe to be incontrovertible and true without a single exception, should be allowed to teach us a most needed and a most salutary lesson. Science has her own methods and criteria, and will not depart from them, whether she ought to or not. Facts are stubborn and obstinate things, and he that comes into conflict with them or allows himself to infringe upon them, is sure to get the worst of it.

This then is the first point in our Article—namely, that in any conflict between a fact of Science and a dogma of Theology, where the fact is indubitably established by the methods of science and by scientific men, the dogma of the Theologians must go under and give way, notwithstanding any pretence of Revelation they may adduce in favor of their position.

We pass then to our second point—the *actual* relation of Revelation and Science.

And here we do not propose to enter into detail or to discuss at all any particular subject or fact in regard to which the teachings of the two respectively may be thought to be in contrariety. We propose to suggest a general view that will, as we believe, serve to explain them all—that is, *after* both science and theology have done their proper work in correcting their own errors and prepared for the contrast—not to say contest—their ultimate and most exact statements. And in speaking of Revelation in this connection we do not intend to assume or to repudiate any particular theory of inspiration. We speak rather of what the writers of the Bible had in mind when they wrote the sacred pages—or what they may be supposed to have intended in what they say.

And our proposition is that the relation or attitude of the facts of science and the statements of the sacred writers is not one of contradiction or contrariety even, when properly considered, but

rather it is that of two persons giving explanations of the same thing from different points of view. In a distinct and scientific statement we say that while the writers of Revelation speak of the facts and phenomena of Nature from the point of view of the Efficient Cause, the writers of Science speak of the same facts from the point of view of the Occasional or Instrumental Causes.

Take as an illustration. We suppose that all persons believe that St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and constantly speak of him as the author of that Epistle. But in the Epistle itself it is expressly declared that "I Tertius wrote it." (Rom. xvi. 22.) Are we wrong? Did Tertius write the epistle in any such way or sense, as that St. Paul was not its author? And did he not "write" it too? The question is easily settled, and has long been settled. Tertius "wrote" it as *amanuensis*; St. Paul as *author*. The Apostle as efficient cause, his friend and amanuensis as instrumental cause; they both wrote it, but each in a different sense of the word from the other.

Let us look at the facts. The Scripture writers knew nothing of science as we use the word in these days; nothing of its formulae, its terms, and almost nothing of its facts. They regarded GOD as the only cause, His will as the only law, and consequently they spoke of everything as His act, His doing; everything at least that was considered good and beneficial in its results. But with the modern *savant*, intent upon the pursuit of science, it is far otherwise. The very first step in his method is to look at the facts, to observe their laws, and to investigate their causes. But what are causes? Why, the next fact before any one that had a tendency or agency in producing it; and laws are but the modes and ways in which these causes or forces act. The next step, however, carries the student of science out of the domain of *his* department entirely, and across its boundary into the domain of metaphysics. He passes a boundary for the most part without so much as getting his passport *viséed*, or even having a passport at all; and what is worse, without taking the slightest notice of the laws and manners and customs of the new country into which he has entered. He passes from the consideration of concrete substances to the speculation about invisible forces, and force in general. Thus he sees that objects that are warmer or hotter than those around them always produce certain effects upon them;

warmth expands, perhaps melts or even volatilizes them. Hence dashing at once into the region of metaphysics, without so much as a thought that he is doing so, he begins to speak of an unknown, unseen, intangible something which he calls *heat*, and ascribes to it the phenomena which he has actually seen produced by heated objects, one by one, upon others less heated than themselves. In the same way he extemporizes the other six incorporeal causes or forces. We believe there are just six more, seven in all—heat, light, electricity, magnetism, affinity, cohesion and gravity. And as the old Hebrew and Christian writers spoke of God as the cause of all things, the modern man of science speaks of these as the causes or forces that produce them. St. Paul doubtless wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and yet Tertius was doubtless right, also, when he said or wrote “I Tertius wrote it.”

Now unquestionably Science and Revelation are both right as truly and as really as both St. Paul and Tertius, when they both claim to have written the Epistle to the Romans. For, waiving the question for the present, regarding the reality of light, heat, etc., as forces or causes—they are one in nature, and in every event and phenomenon occurring there or elsewhere, two causes to each of them. In nature no event, fact, phenomenon or change occurs without—first, an efficient cause that produced it; and secondly, an occasional cause that put that efficient cause into a state of activity; and in moral or human action no act takes place without the efficient cause, which is the agent himself, and a final cause of motion. As an example of the former, take the case of the explosion of gunpowder. The nitrogen in the composition was doubtless the efficient cause, but a spark falling upon the powder was the occasional cause, and both and each of these alike are spoken of in the common use of language as “*the cause*,” as if there were but one, and *it* were the only one.

We often represent this matter—the difference between the Scripture and the scientific representations of the phenomena of nature, under a simile or allegory of this kind. Two persons approach a large manufacturing establishment, such as is found only in modern times, but may be found almost anywhere in the modern civilized world; there it stands an imposing structure; its walls conceal all within from the view of outside observers. The one approaches; he sees around the doors manufactured articles of

most curious structure and admirable use. He sees at one end the immense column of water running into the mill or under its basement, it makes a tremendous noise, it comes out at the side or other end of the mill in great agitation, with great rapidity—all covered with froth and foam; and he goes away impressed with the idea that the *water* has done all this wonderful work of manufacturing. And as he enjoys the benefits of the change he feels grateful to the running water, warms not only with gratitude but with exciting imagery and poetic diction, and he sings its praise in "lofty verse." The other, and of course he must be a modern *savan*, with keen eye and skeptic inquisitiveness, approaches. He enters the establishment, does not even stop to see that water runs into the mill under it, or out of it at all. But he sees the wonders of machinery, for he is inside of the mill; shafts rolling, bands running, wheels, large and small, revolving; some slowly and with tremendous power, others rapidly and with as tremendous celerity; and right out from the midst of all this noise and motion come the manufactured articles. His eye sees the whole process from beginning to end; he even calculates the velocity and force of every wheel, pully-band, tooth or cog; nay he can go out and make a drawing of every machine and every part of it. He can explain to you the principle of every operation and transformation; he can tell exactly how everything was done, and how the result would have varied if the processes or the machinery had been at all different. Does not he know it all? Who shall dispute his word? And yet he tells you that **MACHINERY** has done for us all these wonders of manufacture. Well, who shall say that it has not? But did not the **WATER** have something to do with it, as our first, though unskeptical and perhaps unscientific friend supposed and reported? Are they not both right? Did not St. Paul and Tertius both write the Epistle to the Romans? The modern man of science knows perfectly well that shafts, wheels, pulleys and bands will not roll and move without a force to propel them. But he knows also that it makes no difference so far as his *science* is concerned, whether that force be man or beast, steam, wind, or running water. The ancient inspired writer knew nothing of shafts, wheels and bands. He had never seen into the mill; had scarcely so much as suspected that there was any machinery at all in it. He had no idea of a Tertius, who wrote the Epistle to the

Romans. The modern man of science has been so much engrossed and occupied with Tertius, that he has forgotten that there is or ever was a Paul who could be said in any sense to have written it. Now we think that there was both a Paul and a Tertius, and that Tertius was a very insignificant person, indeed, compared with St. Paul.

Or again, Suppose a thunder shower has occurred. Our man of modern science knows all about it. He tells us of heat as expanding the particles of water and causing evaporation from land and water. The particles of water thus released from cohesion are absorbed in the air, ascend and are carried with it whithersoever the current of the winds may blow. When this portion of air, by its motion comes into contact with a colder current or is in any way reduced in temperature; its capacity to retain moisture is reduced and the particles of water being brought under the influence of cohesion again, are formed into drops, and their gravity brings them in the form of rain to the earth. But in these processes electricity is excited, and the electric state of different masses of wind or of cloud and the earth, becomes such that the electricity in attempting to pass from one to the other, meeting resistance, an explosion takes place and a spark or flash of lightning is the result. The sound being echoed and re-echoed from cloud to hill gives the prolonged and rumbling sound so often heard as thunder. Surely Tertius wrote the Epistle to the Romans; nothing is clearer or more certain; there was no Paul. The phenomena do not imply one; they are easily understood and explained without: it is but the sheerest folly and superstition to suppose there ever was such a person.

But the eminent prophet, knew nothing of all this. With him Paul was the only person thought of. God made the thunder. God sent the rain. He knew nothing of heat and cohesion, and gravity, and electricity. He had never heard of Tertius, did not know that there was such a person, and did not much care whether there was or not. Paul was enough for him.

Now to scientific men and on purely scientific grounds, we can show that, if they stop at objects in nature or with the invisible forces already spoken of, as heat, light, &c., their explanation of the phenomena of Nature—and so their Science—is not complete or satisfactory. We may start with any phenomenon—the

result will be the same. Let it be the birth of a human child: the event implies two parents existing before the child, in a state of physical maturity. This event is therefore one in a series—and the law of that series the law of birth and parentage—is offspring from two parents and of the same species as the parents. To this there is no known exception: no departure from that law has ever been observed to take place—nor would any birth however abnormal or monstrous be recognized as a departure. Human offspring from human parents, apples from apple trees, peaches from peach trees, pears from pear trees, thus, and not otherwise does the law of reproduction take place. Within the species new varieties may arise, and varieties may vary still more and more widely: but they never do—they never have in the observation of man in any one simple instance, passed over the bounds that limit and distinguish the species so as to become another species. Never apples on pear trees, or peaches on apple trees—never human offspring from any other than human parents.

But there was a time when there were no human parents—when there was for the first time on this earth a human being—this and all that I have said above, all men of science admit. Now how came this first *human* being? Not by and in accordance with the law of the series; since there were no *human* parents from whom he could have been born. Suppose he was *immediately* created from the dust of the earth; then the act of creation implies a Creator and cannot take place without. Or was the first human being born of *unhuman*—not to say *inhuman*—parents. To say nothing of the physical difficulties, here is a phenomenon *supposed* for the occasion the like of which confessedly has never been seen or known to occur; one therefore contrary to all experience and all the observed and known laws of the universe: and the fact itself implies a cause or agent outside of mere physical nature as much and as truly as the creation of such an one immediately and out of the dust of the earth would imply a Creator. The first term of a series is never produced by any preceding term of the series, nor in accordance with the law of the series. Such a supposition would imply and could easily be reduced to a contradiction in terms. The theory of development or derivation, therefore, does not get rid of the necessity of supposing something more than the mere visible material objects, and the

invisible forces of nature as a means of accounting for the phenomena of nature.

But suppose we waive that difficulty. We gain nothing and lose nothing so far as the exigency of the argument is concerned, for in the course of our retrocession into the geologic ages we soon come to a time when there was no parentage of any kind. No living things of any order or species to be the parents of another. How then came the first living thing into existence? Not by parentage, for there were then no parents. Without parentage? then by a new law and a new agent working by that law. Or suppose we go back of the existence of any living or organic things to the beginning of motion and change. We encounter the same problem. Matter is inert, both mechanically and chemically. If we see a mass starting from rest to motion or changing the direction or velocity of its motion we know that there is a force not its own, not of itself, acting upon it. If we see two substances in contact but not acting upon each other, begin to act, we know that there has been a third substance in some way brought to act upon them. And the first substance or force that thus begins to act cannot have been inert or material. For then, He cannot have had somebody or something as an occasional or second cause to act upon Him. Shafts, and wheels, and pulleys will not turn and revolve without a propelling power that acts upon them. Machinery will not run without a moving force. Hence Revelation is right in speaking of a Mover or First Cause.

And so undoubtedly Science is right in speaking of physical causes in nature. So far as Science can know or her methods ascertain, God does not act without means or instruments. Just as in the human body the soul moves the feet, the hands, &c., and accomplishes all that of which it, in any sense is the efficient cause and moving agent, by means of bones, muscles and veins, and never accomplishes anything without, so in the physical universe God acts somewhere, *upon* matter and then through all the multiplied forms of material phenomena, by *means* of material instruments. But as with the soul so with the Author of the Universe, He must act somewhere directly on matter.

Take an illustration. Suppose the hand of a person in connection with the conducting wire of an electric machine, and the connection properly made, and the machine in motion. A current

passes up the sensory fibres of the arm to the spinal cord and is thence reflected back down the motor fibres to the muscles of the arm, and an apparent motion takes place, and this motion is involuntary and irresistible. Its cause—that is instrumental or secondary cause—was the electrical machine. Its first or primary cause was the *person* who set the machine in motion; for except as the machine is in motion no such effort will ensue. And the man must be a being capable of voluntary action. No matter what amount of machinery may have intervened between this person and the machine itself—no matter if even an animal had been attached to it, and trained to turn it, yet we come inevitably in the last analysis to a human agent—a person, at least acting *voluntarily and spontaneously* as the first cause of the electric shock and the contraction of the muscles which produced the motion in the arm of the subject. Now without any such machine, we can *voluntarily* produce a similar motion in the muscles of the arm. Who or what is now the first cause of the motion? We know, as matter of science, that (as before) our motion comes from the spinal cord down the motor nerve of the arm. We know also that this motion had its origin in the hemisphere of the brain, and passed from thence down the spinal cord to the origin of the nerves of the arm between the shoulders. But the brain itself: who or what set that in motion or put it in action? It is material: it obeys or acts under the law of inertia, like all other merely material substances. It can act only as it is acted upon; it can move only as it is moved. It is only a second cause, never is, and never can be, from its very nature a first cause. It no more accounts for the motions in the arm without something not material acting upon it, than the electric machine accounts for the similar motion in the arm without somebody setting the machine in motion. And this something that acts *on* the brain and *by means of* the brain must act under the law of spontaneity and not under that of inertia; it must therefore be emotional, personal, capable of thought and volition and final cause or purpose.

So in the material universe. No matter how many intervening second causes or means there may be, we come at last and by inevitable necessity, to something that is before second causes, inert means, one which is not inert—which is spontaneous—possessed

of intelligence, will and moral nature: for that is implied in purpose and final cause. At this personal something—we say, we arrive at last from any fact or phenomena in nature that we may choose to take for our starting point. As in mathematical series if it be an arithmetical series with a common difference of two, and any given term, that we may happen to light upon be an *odd* number, we know that the first term could not have been an *even* number. We need not know how many terms there may have been; we need not know what the first term was, where it was, or when it was; we know from the two facts, namely, that the present term is odd, and that the common difference is two or any other *even* number, that the first term must have been one odd number also. Or, again, if we have a geometrical series, no matter what the ratio, no matter what the first term, no matter what the given term, we know that there was a first term and that that term could not have been a Zero. So in nature. No matter how many intermediate second causes, instruments or means; we come at last to the first cause, which from the nature of the series must have been Something—not a Zero (for then there could have been no subsequent terms in the series,) and that this first cause or something could not have been inert, for then it could not have been a first term in any such series. It was in its nature First, Spontaneous, Personal, Spiritual: for whatever is first, spontaneous and personal, is spiritual, and whatever is first must be spontaneous or it could not be first, and whatever is spontaneous is personal.

And this First Cause in the Universe, like the soul of man in his brain, must act directly and immediately on matter. But how we know not, and probably never shall know. The fact we cannot deny; the mode we cannot explain. In the human body it seems to be a pretty well established fact in psychology, that the soul never acts immediately except upon the brain itself, and that all its other action is immediate, and by means of nerves, muscles, &c. It would seem however in the universe that G d's action must be immediate on each piece and kind of matter. Take for example the simple fact of the falling of an apple, when the stem that connected it with the parent tree had been severed. The men of modern Science—the believers in a Tertius without a Paul—say, sometimes, that gravity brings it down or again, without obstruc-

tion, that the earth brings it down. But how comes the earth to attract the apple or to be an attracting body at all? How came Tertius to write if there is no Paul to dictate? On any theory of the material universe which the present state of physical Science with regard to objects that make up that universe will allow us to entertain or soberly mention for a moment, there was a time when this earth did not exist as an attracting mass at all,—nay a time when the particles of matter even if they were in existence, did not attract each other or cohere at all. How then came the first *active* state of those particles? Who made them to combine chemically, to cohere and to gravitate? And who makes them now to unite, cohere and gravitate, whenever union, cohesion or gravity take place? We can conceive them to exist without such activity. We know that they did once exist without it. If they act themselves now, it is not, *sud sponte*, spontaneously—but as second causes, and under the law of inertia. But whose is the power by which they act? Not of course their own, innately and intrinsically—for then they would always have had it; and there could have been no time when they did not act. Primarily therefore the power is not their own. It is derived; it was given to them: it may be suspended, annulled or taken from them.

One thought more as to the difference between spontaneous and inert bodies or causes. A body acting under the law of inertia acts constantly and with the same force. Thus the earth attracts the moon with the same force and cannot change it to make it more or less to meet emergencies, move more or less at another time. But with any spontaneous being it is not so. We for example take hold of any thing to lift it; if it is light we put forth but little force: if it is heavy we put to the more strength until it rises, provided it is not so heavy that we cannot lift it. And when our object has been accomplished we cease to lift or make effort of that kind altogether. And this is action under the law of spontaneity. It is what spiritual personal beings do and what distinguishes them from mere inert matter. No mere material body can do so. If it coheres or attracts it does so with a force that is unceasing, unvarying—except as the force may, in certain cases, be made to vary or cease by something external acting upon it. And if in the whole universe there was a single particle of matter that was not inert and did not act under this law, then

Science itself would be at an end, for there could be no certainty, no uniformity in the phenomena of motion any more than there now is in the acts of the most incomprehensible and wayward of human beings.

We have then the result. God and human beings are spontaneous: matter and all material things are inert—the powers they have or that are ascribed to them, are not their own. If they unite, cohere, gravitate, &c., &c., and in their processes, evolve (as the expression is) heat, light, electricity, &c.,—it is all of God and the powers that God has given them. And whether He acts personally in every moment and instance of attraction, cohesion, &c.; or whether He has given them the power to act—made them active under the law of inertia—we do not know. Nor is it necessary for any purpose that we have in view, that we should know. One theory is as good for our purpose as the other: though it seems most congenial to our present mode of thought to suppose that they act themselves as inert masses. But even so; we cannot get rid of the idea of His constant, indwelling, sustaining, creative power; in each and any one of them that they may exist, cohere, attract, &c.

And now what are the means or second causes by which He acts? Are they the imponderable forces and agents, heat, light, &c.? or are they the material masses themselves? So far as our present argument is carried it can make no difference. For if heat, for example, is a cause or an agent at all, it must be either spontaneous or inert. The words are contradictions—there can be no *tertium quid* between them. If heat or any of the imponderable forces or agents, be a force or agent at all and is spontaneous then it is God,—not matter or material at all—but spirit, First Cause, Personal Agent—God Himself, the Propelling Power that moves the machinery in the mill, the Paul that dictates to Tertius. If it be not all this, and yet be an agent or force, it is matter and so inert; as means or second cause only implies a spiritual Person, who uses it as a means or second cause. And of course the same may be said of light, electricity, magnetism, affinity, cohesion and gravity.

But the mischief of the thing is that mere physicists think by speaking of these forces as immaterial to escape the conclusion that there is a God whose presence or agency is implied in the

phenomena of the material world. Of course the properties of mere inert unthinking matter are not sufficient to explain the visible phenomena of material things. Hence the imponderable agents are called in as convenient somethings,—nobody knows or can exactly tell what—that are not matter nor yet God, and of which we may for the purposes of speculation make any thing that we please so as to account for the phenomena of nature without implying the existence of a Personal Creator or Moral Governor of the Universe. “Make what you will of Tertius, we will have no Paul to dictate dogmas to us—domineer over our opinions, control our actions and keep us in fear all our lives long of a final judgment and a life to come—any thing but that.”

It is worthy of special note the prominence and emphasis that these physical writers of modern science give to their statements of our ignorance of the nature of force. Many of them even write and print the word with a capital letter—Force—as if that word were more acceptable to them than that other word which Jews would not pronounce; which all modern believers pronounce with reverence, and all Christians with love and inexpressible delight—God—so constantly, repeatedly, emphatically do they affirm that we do not know what force or Force is. Well then, if we do not know *what* force is, how do we know *that* it is at all? “Oh, but it produces effects.” Very well. But if we *know* so much about it we *know* no more than that. Does it produce its effects under the law of inertia, regularly, uniformly, and in accordance with unvarying law? Or does it produce them as human beings do spontaneously and with something of irregularity, uncertainty and caprice? One or the other is inevitable. There is no third way; and if you *know*, actually know, that it produces effects at all, you must know in which of these two ways it produces them; and in knowing that you know enough to enable you to decide whether force be matter or God, a created *thing*, or a creating *Person*. We cannot allow you to explain the phenomena of the material universe by mere creatures of your own fancy, figments that you can even make to be one thing, and then another, as may best suit *your* purpose, without giving us some means to judge of them ourselves, and seeing whether they exist or not. The world is too much in earnest to allow of such trifling in her high places. The heart of man is too impatient to be put off with any such trickery. The

anxious conscience is too restless under its burden of guilt and fear to be contented with only such assurance as your ever heartless "*Unknowable*" can afford. Tertius don't satisfy us. The heart and conscience cry out, most impatiently cry out, for Paul—the inspired, the correct, the sympathizing Paul. We do not believe in machinery that runs without an impelling force. Neither do you. We believe in the Force and the machinery; you believe in the Machinery and the force. We are not enemies. We do not contradict each other. Cannot we be friends and agree? We must come to argument. The onward course of thought will compel us to it. You must acknowledge that machinery cannot run without force; and we shall be brought to confess that force can do nothing without machinery. You cannot believe in a world without a God, though you may even pretend to do so; and even this pretence cannot be kept much longer. It ought not for the cause of humanity and the comfort of your own hearts to be kept up any longer. Believe, confess, love and adore, and your science itself becomes divine, a revelation of God Himself. We do not believe in a God without a world; nor shall we, or can we, if we would, continue much longer to believe that He works in this world and in the ordinary course of affairs, except by means and instrumentalities and in conformity with laws, and that is Science.

And this brings us to the third point in our Essay. It is the most practical, and yet the most difficult point of all. It is that we must recognize and acknowledge the attainments of science. In our theology, in our preaching and our teaching, we must recognize the world and all the objects in it, as God's agent and instrumentality, with which He works and without which we have no right to expect Him to work. We may pray for rain, but we must not now expect or *trust* that He will send it except through the known processes and agencies of heat, evaporation, condensation, cohesive gravity, etc. We may pray for health and wealth, but we must not expect or *trust* that He will send either except as we conform to and obey the laws of health and the acquisition of wealth. We may hope and pray for the conversion of the heathen, but we must work also, and not expect their conversion without the use of ordinary means, with ordinary discouragements and delays; for "in Him we live and move and have our being."

All this is easily believed and readily assented to in general.

But we are too apt to forget in practice, and then deny it by implication. It is the constant habit which the men of science have of speaking of natural things as if there were no God, that alienates us from them, and makes us distrustful of them and of science. And it is our constant habit of speaking of God as if He worked without means in the phenomena of nature, and in accordance to its laws, that makes them distrust, and look upon us as shallow babblers, canting hypocrites, or designing impostors.

That the whole tendency of scientific education in our day is against us we cannot deny; the great mass of the scientific men are slipping away from our influence, losing their confidence in the Church and in revealed Theology. The whole tendency and current of thought is setting in that direction. It would be easy to accumulate statistics to confirm this assertion. But the fact is too obvious to need this kind of confirmation. Now we can arrest this current, and regain them back only by recognizing the facts and laws of science. We cannot do it by denying their facts and denouncing their persons. We cannot do it by teaching that religion is essentially, totally distinct from science, and that without being contradictory they are at best only supplementing the one or the other; so that a man may attend to his religion and do up his piety on Sundays, and attend to science through the week.

To illustrate what we mean, we quote a passage from that most charming little book, "The Little Episcopalian:"

"But mother, what is the reason I am not so strong as Bessie?"

* * * * *

"Because, my dear, God did not make you so. He did not give you as vigorous a constitution as He gave your sister."

"And why *didn't* He, mother? Why did not God make us both strong and well?"

"Ah, my child! your mother cannot tell you that. But this I can tell you, Jennie: God has some wise and good reason for making you a frail, delicate little girl."

Now we would not have this answer different *under the circumstances*. It was true, and it was all the truth that the circumstances required or would well permit of being uttered at the time. But did the mother believe that it was all of the truth? all that she as a mother ought to have known? Such teaching is wise and well to induce patient resignation under evils that we cannot help

or cure, and to prompt us to make the best of unfavorable circumstances over which we have no control. But he or she that takes no other view takes only a half view, and often the other half that is left out of sight and out of thought is that which most of all should have been noted. Suppose the mother had said in this case, "You are indeed weakly and feeble, my darling child, and it is *my* fault. God is good and loving to all His creatures. I spoilt your constitution by my own folly and dissipation; my own neglect and disobedience of God's laws, when you were too young to know anything or do anything that could displease Him. And now He is so merciful and good that He will give you patience and resignation, an abiding sense of His goodness and love, that will make you happier even under your misfortune than your sister can be, or will be without." We do not know what the mother's fault may have been, or what the father's. But we do know, and modern science demands what we admit, that there was some disregard of the laws of health that caused the feebleness of their offspring. They may have been ignorant of those laws; they may have been so situated that the fulfillment of them was impossible. But when parents continue habits of dissipation, idleness and vice, or indulgence in angry passions before the birth of their children, they have no right to blame God for the feebleness of their constitutions. If parents who are scrofulous, consumptive, insane, etc., by constitution and by hereditary descent, or will marry incestuously, they ought to know that God, good as He is, works by means, and not without means; and He is no more responsible for the frailty, deformity or idiocy of their children, than He is for the explosion by which the assassin sends the fatal bullet through the heart of his victim.

If now we would gain the confidence of scientific men and win them back to Revelation and to Religion, we must *accept science into our theology and make it a part of it.* We must acknowledge that Tertius wrote the Epistle; for the Epistle itself expressly says so, if we would have the men of science respect our opinions and assent to our teachings when we say that Paul wrote it.

Doubtless there are times when, as we have said, we should say that "God sends our sickness"—and that is all that we need to say, all that the occasion demands at such times. But it is not all that we need to know. It is not all that we must acknowledge

in regard to it some time, and there are occasions when we must say that the sickness has come from our own fault or folly. Justice to God requires that we shall acknowledge this. Fidelity to ourselves requires that we should acknowledge it. Fairness to the men of science requires that we should confess that so much of what they teach is true.

And so in every department of applied Theology. We go among the poor. It is well to tell them that idleness and prodigality will cause poverty, and in so far as their poverty and distress have come from these faults of their own, they have nobody to blame but themselves. And on the other hand it is just as well to tell the rich that industry, frugality and economy, are sure means to wealth. But we must not tell them that the possession of wealth always implies that they have practiced those virtues, or that it in any way implies some mysterious and unknown cause of God's special favor to them. For we *know* that fraud and oppression often produce wealth and station and power; and that the poor and down-trodden are not always in that miserable condition, because God had forsaken them, or because they are sinners above all others of their fellow-men. God can indeed comfort and relieve them in their poverty; but He has not brought it upon them except by their own idleness and improvidence, and not at all therefore, unless they have been idle and improvident. If by the financial and commercial policy of the government that is over them they have been brought into a condition where they must labor for a few pennies a day, while others who lord it over them produce nothing and live in affluence and splendor, we don't think we do the cause of Science or of Revelation much good service when we speak to them or their oppressors of their condition as being an allotment of Providence. Neither they nor their oppressors are likely to have much respect for a "Providence" that can perform such exploits among men. Juggle the matter as we will, cover it with sophistry as we please; it is not God's doings when the industrious poor cannot by their labor earn enough for the purposes of comfortable, honest, virtuous living, while there are unindustrious idlers, who manage, somehow or another, to get out of the earnings of the laborer enough to live in affluence and splendor.

No; we must take science into theology, if we would save theology

itself from utter neglect, and scientific men from utter unbelief and rejection of Revelation altogether. Whatever fact, or principle, or law, science has attained or may attain, is so much added to our knowledge of the will and purposes of God, the way in which He does things, the way in which we should act to obey His will, keep His laws and secure His favor and the rewards of His moral government. Every fact discovered, every principle ascertained, is a revelation in the department of Theology itself; it is by so much a disclosure of a mystery that has hitherto been hid from our knowledge; it is so much added to that that we already know, to make us wiser unto salvation. There is no conflict between Science and Revelation; the one explains the other, and each, as the past has undoubtedly shown, is unintelligible without the other; and the more we know of Science the better we shall understand Revelation itself. Let us be friends, we theologians and scientists. When I say God has sent me this disease, and he says I brought it upon myself by my intemperance, or over exertion, by the use of tobacco, or by both study and insufficient exercise, don't let us fall to contradicting, disputing, calling hard names, and denouncing each other as bigots, imbeciles, etc., etc., but rather let us each say "you are right, brother," the whole truth is "God did send it upon me by means of my own vices and faults."

And let us amend our teaching and our preaching accordingly. We think that scientific men will not be slow or reluctant to acknowledge our theology, if we will accept their science. They—that is all of them that are fair-minded and candid, and most of them are really such—are not unwilling to acknowledge the existence of God, if we will acknowledge that *He*—namely the God we believe in—works in the ways and by the means that they in their investigations have found that *somebody* works in. And if this acknowledgment shall be found to require some modification of our theology, do not let us be alarmed. Theology is *of men*, truth is *of God*, and Revelation but not theology, is from God. All systems of Divinity are hence made for ourselves; honestly and faithfully made, no doubt. But the day for believing in human infallibility has gone by. Unquestionably every Christian believes in the fourteenth, and in all preceding centuries believed and would have deemed as an article of truth, if not as an article of "the Faith:" 1st. That the Bible did teach something concerning

the motions of the earth, and the heavenly bodies, and the age of the earth; and 2d, that that something was that the earth was stationary, and had been created only about six thousand years. And yet they were all wrong. Let us learn that Science may yet correct our Theology in still other points. Truth it cannot correct. Revelation it cannot correct, for Revelation cannot be wrong, though we may be wrong in our interpretation of the words of Revelation, and the design and purpose of Him who spoke to us by Prophets, and in the latter days by His Son.

God and Nature are in harmony. He is the author of Nature, and Nature is His creation. He works through and by means of Nature. Nature does and can do nothing without Him. And He does not, except in miracles, work except through Nature. But we believe in miracles. Miracles have been wrought. One was wrought when, on this earth inorganic matter first took on the form of organic life, and became a living thing. Another was wrought whenever and on each occasion where there appeared the first individual or the first pair of any new distinct species in the organic world, whether of plants or animals. No theory of development or derivation can escape this result. They can at most vary the form in which the miracle occurred, but none of them can explain away the miraculous nature of the event. And we believe, too, that each of the great epochs in the religious history of men, the covenant of Abraham, the Mosaic polity and the Christian Dispensation has been ushered in and attested by miracles. But we doubt if since the introduction of Christianity miracles have been wrought. And we expect no more hereafter. Hence whatever God does now He does in a *natural* way; in the way of nature, the way of law, of cause and effect, the way of means and instrumentalities, the way of uniformity and regularity, so that men may learn His ways from the facts of nature in the pursuits of science as well as in the study of the Bible; and learn from the study of both how to regulate their actions, what to expect from the use of means, and what to dread from a violation of God's laws, that in short they may act as intelligent, moral beings in the exercise of will and choice, forming for themselves characters and growing up by these means and God's grace, assisting them into the nature of the fullness of Christ.

We have no right to expect and cannot righteously have, any-

thing that we do not obtain by the use of the means God has appointed for such ends. Those means are two; work and prayer—the Bible, Revelation, Theology teach about prayer—Science teaches about labor—the means to use, the way to use them, the effects they will produce, the mistakes to be avoided, the dogmas to be guarded against. Both are needful; Science and Theology—both are helpful—they are twin sisters and necessary to each other.

What prayer can do for us Science can never tell. That it has a powerful subjective effect we know. He that prays sincerely and earnestly is always the better for his praying. The Bible teaches also that it has an objective effect; it helps us to that which we righteously ask for. Science will of course be skeptical about any effect of prayer except that produced upon our own hearts. But it can never prove that there are no other; and believers, those who have believing hearts, will always probably believe that there is, (we are no prophets and do not much believe in uninspired prophecy, therefore we say probably), they will always think that God in answer to prayer disposes the order of events in the outward world somewhat in regard to the welfare of His people. And as we have said, Science cannot prove that He does not. It cannot deny His existence. It cannot deprive Him of personality. And personality consists in doing voluntary, optional things. But He is a righteous Governor; and the righteousness of government consists in its being according to law. The laws of nature are the common understanding between God and His creatures, a part of the contract and covenant between Him and them, whereby they may know what to do and what to expect. A departure from them to favor our view, would be a damage to many others and an injustice to all. Here we must expect no miracles—no departures from general laws. But we do not know and never can know the laws of nature well enough to say that there can be no personal favor, no loving-kindness, no fatherly hand in the administration of those laws, favoring the righteous and “tempering the wind to the shorn lamb.” We can never sufficiently comprehend the possibilities—limitations there are none—of the wisdom and omnipotence of God, to say that He cannot do anything that is in itself possible and righteous.

But Science, and Science alone can teach us what work is and how it is to be performed. And both Science and Revelation concur in teaching that without work prayer is unavailing—"Knowledge is power," and science gives us knowledge. And we do not limit the word science in this connection to any of its narrower significations. We use the word to signify and include all that man can *know*. It includes all that does not rest on mere *faith*. It includes the common sense notion that all have and acquire by observation and experience no less than the constant deductions of a most abstruse investigation. It includes History and Political Economy as well as Physiology and Chemistry. It includes whatever we can learn or know of God's works and ways, without Revelation and by the unaided exercise of our own natural faculties.

And in the recognition which we are thus to give to science, we are, of course, to limit ourselves to those facts and laws that are ascertained beyond further question or doubt among the students of the sciences themselves. We are to recognize, as we do, the fact that the earth is a revolving globe—that it has existed in one form or another for a period indeterminately long. Whether we shall at once and now admit the great antiquity of man, as an inhabitant of the earth may be a matter of doubt. We believe that *all* the students of physical science, and especially those who are acknowledged as professionals in geology, are agreed on this point, and if so, it is only a question of time when and how soon other persons will come to acknowledge it. And if we hold back *unreasonably*, we do, by inevitable consequence, just so much estrange the confidence of scientific men, alienate their affections and lose all hold upon them for good. With regard to the other great and exciting theory of the day, Development, and the derivation of higher species from lower without any Divine interposition—any miraculous interference of God in the works of creation, most assuredly we are not called upon to accept it. For it is still in dispute and is opposed by some of the greatest names in the ranks of modern science. Even its advocates admit that there is a gap in the evidence, a want of facts to confirm or sustain one of its most fundamental assumptions. The advocates of the theory offer it only as a way in which the origin of species *may have occurred*, and adduce certain facts to show (what no one can doubt) that

there are certain tendencies and influences in that direction. But they do not claim that any actual case of transmutation or derivation like what they suppose, has ever occurred under the observation or within the knowledge of man. The whole tenor and current of experience without an exception is the other way. And it seems to us, regarding the matter purely from the stand-point of the history of the progress of the Inductive Sciences, that we must judge that any theory occupying the position that those of development and derivation do, will never be established or reckoned among the truths of Science, but will, on the contrary, be consigned to the receptacle of the wild speculations of those who allow their fancy to outrun the dictates of reason. This we say we merely judge from the general aspect of the case without regard to the special condition of the arguments for or against the theories.

With regard to all such theories our attitude and our strength undoubtedly is "to stand still" and "in patience possess our souls." Doubtless the spectacle is exciting: doubtless grave interests are at stake, the faith of many will be undermined and souls will be ruined by the promulgation of such theories. But has not the experience of the past three centuries taught us that our interposition is unavailing? No warning that we can give—no denunciation that we can utter—no argument that we, as theologians, can urge will have the slightest tendency to arrest the evil. We may, in our private capacity,—by gentleness and meekness exert a salutary and, by God's blessing, a saving influence upon here and there one and another who are doubting or in danger. But no public attitude of ours, but the calm dignified silence of reserve, can do any good. And this *will* do good; for it will show our faith and trust in God: it will show more than that, it will show our candor and our willingness to admit that there may yet be truths and phases of truth that we have not taken into consideration, and that we are willing to accept them whenever we shall see that they are proved to be truths. But these scientific men will fight the battle out among themselves, without our aid and little regarding what we may say, whether of hope or of fear. If the thing proposed be truth, it is of God and we cannot resist or overthrow it; if not it will come to nought of itself. Scientific men are too ambitious, too jealous of each other to allow the mere opinions and suggestions of any one man or party to be accepted as true so long as, in the strength of argu-

ments and facts, they can prevent it. Doubtless, these controversies promote infidelity, and infidelity is a great evil, ruining souls for time and for eternity. But for every soul that infidelity has ruined we may say in the face of facts and of history, more than one has been ruined by superstition and bigotry. Whom did our Lord denounce most severely, the unbelieving, infidel Sadducees, or the superstitious, bigoted Scribes and Pharisees? To which of these classes did He say, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures?" and to which "Ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" No, God waits and is patient: we can afford to do so too. And whatever may be the fact in the case, we can avoid giving the impression that we are impatient, and if impatient we are, it comes from an unwillingness to have the foundations of our position scrutinized—a suspicion perhaps not even confessed to ourselves, that some of our dogmas will not abide the test of truth.

Recall the age and history of Galileo. The theologians of that age with great unanimity thought him wrong. They thought him a heretic, an enemy to Christianity, undermining the faith, and as a consequence they not only denounced him, but even compelled him to denounce himself. But who in the judgment of this age, and of all ages to come, is, and is to be considered the most heretical, the worst enemy of the truth and of Christianity—most tending to undermine the faith and ruin souls, the doomed and denounced Galileo, or the dooming and denouncing Church that assumed jurisdiction over him and his opinions in matters of science? Let us learn from history; let us grow wise by experience.

The facts of Science which we have occasion to take note of are of two classes. 1st. Those like the ones we have just been considering, which require when they are established and accepted as true, some change in our theology, some change from the commonly received interpretation of the Bible. And 2d. Those which merely serve to illustrate its ethical and practical teachings—the mode and way in which God works to accomplish what He has either promised or threatened—promised to the good and obedient and threatened to the wicked and disobedient. The former facts can only raise questions of interpretation; and the great question of this kind raised and pressed upon us now in this half century of the world's history, by the (claimed) discovery of the

great antiquity of man, is whether the writer of the first chapters in our Bible intended them to be historical or allegorical, history or parable—we might almost say fable or myth—designed not to set forth sober fact, but rather theological doctrine and exhortation to faith and piety. And as the former doctrines concerning the earth and its age, have been accepted without changing a single doctrine of our theology, of that we mean which we regard as fundamental and essential to the faith and to salvation, so they cannot see—and they have tried very hard and very faithfully and fearlessly to show—that the admission of the new doctrine of interpretation—will not in the slightest degree change our view of the great doctrines of Revelation concerning the Fall, and the Redemption of mankind—with whatever is necessarily implied in them.

The influence of the other class of facts is of a different character. They will not require any change in our doctrines or modes of interpretation. They will predispose us not to admit a miracle, when there is not the clearest evidence of a miracle having been wrought. But not even the establishment of the extremest view of Development and Derivation can take from the facts of Science “the testimony of the Rocks,” written ineffaceably in the geological history of the earth, the proof of miraculous Divine interposition “at sundry times and in divers manners” in the past. But they will compel us to appeal to the Bible as a Book whose declarations we must accept though we cannot understand them, and see the reason of what it teaches, less, and to reason and common sense, more. They will lead us to see that although Christianity is in a most important sense, *supernatural*, yet that it is in no sense *unnatural*, that it is on the contrary the most natural thing in the world—that common sense and good sense is the best part of Theology. And Christianity, as the result of Revelation, is but the exegesis of common sense, by means of inspiration, into the sphere which it could not penetrate of itself, and bringing within its grasp and comprehension facts and principles that it otherwise would not dream of. Not that they will remove or explain all mysteries. Mysteries always lie on the margin and outline, in the horizon of our knowledge, and especially in the dim horizon of our knowledge of things divine. Incomprehensible facts and principles there always will be. As fast as

one is cleared up and brought within the grasp of our intelligence another and still others will loom up in the distance. This must ever be the condition of all progressive being—with all but the Omniscient Himself.

These facts will dispose us, and *compel* us too, if we will gain the ear of our congregations and secure their attention at all, to say less of the Divine Agency as such, and after the old manner, and more of the means which *we* are to use and by which God works, than we have been accustomed to do. Not that the Divine Agency is to be denied or overlooked—and man come to trust in himself. Not that at all, but that what men will acknowledge as already sufficiently known, is the promise and aid of God, and that which for the present emergency they most want to hear about is duty. What they have to do. The means they are to use and the use they are to make of them. They will want to understand the machinery as well as the power that propels it. They will want and we must give them, or they will accept nothing from us, not what are called “doctrinal” sermons but “practical” ones. Doctrinal Sermons must be left for special days, as Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Whitsuntide and Trinity. And they will be welcome then if wisely written and reverently delivered.

Christianity when thus presented will be its own best evidence. It can need no other; for it will be seen to be just what the age needs, what the heart and wants of man demand. Make it this and men will not much care how much you claim for it a supernatural origin and a divine character. When they see that it is what they want, that it does not contradict common sense, stultify reason and taboo science,—is not claimed and preached as merely a thing that is by some mysterious way to save men’s souls in another world, while leaving them in doubt whether they have souls to be saved, except as we say that they have, and doing little or nothing to save them from meanness, impurity and contempt in this world, they will accept it. When they see this, they will not care how much we extol its origin or whatever is excellent, exalting or soul-stirring we may say or claim in its favor. They will not care to discuss questions of miracles and theories of inspiration; for they will have made up their minds to accept, for its own excellency’s sake, that which you so seek to support by these claims. They will not be intending to reject or wishing in any

way to get rid of it; and therefore they will not care how high we put its claims or how strongly we put our arguments in its favor. But it seems to us that he has but very imperfectly studied the past or comprehended the present, who has not read in "the signs of the times" the fact that the human race, or at least that part of it that we have to deal with, will not much longer consent to receive on any pretence of Divine authority or any promises of the bliss of heaven, or any threats of the pains of hell, a system that has no affinity or harmony with the deepest wants and the most earnest thoughts of the age. And these wants and thoughts, so far as the masses of mankind are concerned, are not so much how shall we be saved in the next world, as how can we and our fellow-men escape the hell of moral and social ruin in this world, into which we are so rapidly, so recklessly, so hopelessly plunging? "Show us that Christianity, or *anything* else, can help us here in this our direst need, and we will accept it, asking no questions for conscience' sake. And if with this, you can show us that your system gives assurance of a future life and of a preparation for it, by that purification and elevation which is to raise us out of 'the slough of despond' in this, why so much the better. We are yours with all our heart. We and ours are at your disposal. Save us *in* this world, and *for* the next, and that is all we ask." But the mere preaching of theological dogmas will not do this. Ritualism cannot accomplish it. We must descend to first principles; teach line upon line, precept upon precept, the very a b c's of practical morality; the lines and paths and steps of duty, as God has written them in the laws and the very "constitution and course of nature," with a clear exhibition of the rewards of obedience, which are always secured in whatever is well undertaken, provided it is right and honest, and of good report, and the pains and penalties of disobedience, which are always in the line of failure—loss of the confidence and respect of our fellow-men, disease and pain and death *in this world*. And this we must exhibit as men see it, and in such a way that they can verify our teaching by an appeal to their own observation and experience, and say, "that is sensible," "that is God's truth!"

When, a few years ago, the Emperor of Russia was in France and riding through the Boulevards with the Emperor of France, an insane Pole attempted to assassinate the Russian Emperor. On

discovering how narrowly he had escaped, he exclaimed in the pious gratitude of his heart, "We are in the hands of Providence!" "Ah, yes," replied the Mephistophiles of France, "ah yes, and so are the hands of the assassin." We must be able to unravel the sophistry involved in this reply. If God works through the instrumentality of second causes and of natural objects and forces, we must take care that we do not make Him the author and worker of evil as well as good. But we must not in order to avoid such a result, represent Him as working miracles, or as using the objects and forces of nature in part, and when they tend to good, and a devil as using them also when they tend to or result in evil. Two men start on a train of cars, or on a steamer to cross the ocean. Shall we say that he that goes on a good errand or under the influence of pure and right motives, is less likely to meet with an accident, than the man who goes to cheat a friend, assassinate a rival, or betray helpless innocence into servitude and hopeless degradation? One of our earliest recollections is of a warning given us by a pious mother that we should not go to play on a neighboring pond *on Sunday*, because if we did we would surely be drowned. She even urged her warning by the citation of cases of accidents happening to those who were at the time engaged in Sabbath-breaking. The warning was well meant, but it was most unfortunate in its influence. We knew enough, or at least we thought we did, and acted accordingly, to know that accidents by drowning, etc., were no more likely to occur on Sunday than on any other day, other things being equal. God does not enforce positive institutions, or sanction *moral* principles in that way. He punishes transgression of physical laws with physical penalties. If one goes in an insecure boat he is in danger of capsize and drowning, Sunday or any other day alike. If one goes in cars or steamboat in disregard of the *physical* conditions of safety, he is in danger indeed; but the danger is the same whether he is a sinner or a saint; whether he is in pursuit of the basest object the heart of man can conceive, or of the purest and noblest that man can ever subserve. If however he commits a *moral* offence, the penalty is moral. If he tells a lie, betrays a trust, insults the weak and unoffending, he loses the confidence, the respect, the good will of mankind. He may become an outcast, be avoided and despised by all mankind. This is the way God punishes offences against

the moral law, not by capsizing sail-boats, smashing up cars and exploding boilers. Or again, if one breaks the Sabbath or commits any offence against the positive institutions of religion, he not only loses the good will of men to some extent, but he hardens his own heart, deprives himself of all the comforts of hope, all the strengthening influences of faith, all the blessings of a sense of God's goodness and favor. The skies may smile just the same, the rains will fall and the sun will shine, and his crops may grow, but in all these there is no goodness of God *for Him*; that light and blessed assurance are shut out of *his* heart. The ball of the assassin may be averted, but he sees nothing of Providence in it, nothing to be grateful for, nothing to assure him of continual favor, nothing that can take from his bosom the undying worm and the burning flame that gnaws and burns in the anxious distrust and painful forebodings of him who knows not God and does not acknowledge Him in all or any of his ways. He sees and can see no more of God in the ball averted than in the upraised hand of the assassin that propelled it. He sees and can see nothing to be grateful for in the good he enjoys, and he fears only evil in whatever the future may have to unfold.

But our Article is getting too long—we must draw it to a close. We must make our teaching accord with common sense, and acknowledge science as a part of common sense. We must acknowledge God in the works and phenomena of nature ascribed to Him, whatever of good accrues, and to men the ignorance, the inadvertence, the selfishness, whatever of evil may overtake us. There are but these two moral agents—first causes, *real* causes, that we know of or have any account with. We think that the day for the belief in an Ahriman or Evil Spirit, except as it exists in men is fast passing away, even if it has not already gone. Science knows nothing of it, furnishes no proof of its existence, cannot well admit the possibility of it. God has done what is good, men somehow have done what is evil. Some of the good, perhaps much may be man's, but none of the evil can be ascribed to God. When evil is done we do it, when we do evil we work by ourselves, and in our own strength. When we do good we work with God, and God works within us to do that which is well pleasing in His sight. God is in all truth, and in all righteousness. When we are speaking the truth we

are proclaiming His word; when we are acting right we are doing His work, and the success and rewards of Divine favor will be ours.

We trust none of our readers will suppose that we would have our Clergy go to preaching Science or Revelation of any kind, though possibly some of them might be benefited by studies of that kind. But their work is to preach the Gospel, Christ and Him crucified, and that only. But we would not have them preach as though they had lived five centuries ago, or knew nothing of what has occurred since that time; the Faith is of course the same unchanging through the ages. But the vices, the errors, the doubts and the wants that are to be met are various, and to some extent new in any age and peculiar to the age; and whatever the Faith may be the preaching to be effectual must be a ratio between the two, and thus exhibit the characteristics of both.

No one who believes in anything supernatural will object to this, and if one does not he cannot be accommodated by any effort we can make to explain the supernatural out of the Bible, or out of science. But the moment we undertake to preach the gospel or to explain its doctrines and precepts as though that which all scientific men in our age believe were not written or known, they lose confidence in us, and we lose our influence over them; they are even indifferent, skeptical, unbelieving, and perhaps irreconcilably hostile. But with these concessions in their favor, this token of respect to their convictions of what they know, we shall have disarmed prejudice, secured respect for our persons and our office, and be prepared to offer them what their science cannot afford, and what we cannot doubt they will, under such circumstances, be glad to receive.

ART. IV.—A PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD.

QUESTIONS of grave import, relating to doctrine and affecting directly the integrity of our present Book of Common Prayer, are likely to come before our General Convention at its next session. On the one hand there is the yet unsettled question of the Nicene Creed. As is well known to the readers of the Review, the last Convention was formally approached by no less than six Dioceses, and a number of other members of the Church, clerical and lay, who stated in their memorials that they could find in our Prayer Book no correct version of "the Nicene Creed," and asked the General Convention to set forth for them an accurate translation from the Greek of the Ecumenical Symbol, their design being to *use* this translation, where the rubric requires it, immediately after the Gospel in the Communion Service; unless the Apostles' or Nicene had been said immediately before in the Morning Prayer. It is true that at the very close of the Convention, it was voted (with the assent of all the friends of the movement) that action was "*inexpedient at this time.*" But the number and zeal of the memorialists is not likely to decrease with the lapse of time; especially since the remarkable pamphlets of Rev. Mr. Ffoulkes have attracted the attention of the general public to this very point, and have laid bare with a masterly hand the *weakness* of the *Filioque* clause.

But another and widely different movement is now on foot. Within a year past nine or ten of our Rt. Reverend Fathers have put their names to a paper, which declares that the consciences of many of their brethren are burdened by certain phrases in the Office for the Ministration of Baptism to Infants, and relief is asked by the adoption at least of alternate phrases in the Service. The extent of this movement, or the course which its friends will pursue in the event of defeat, we have as yet no means of judging. But this we know, that our next General Convention will be asked by a certain number of clergymen and laymen to alter the Baptismal Office, which has been used in all branches of the Anglican Church since the Reformation, and to cancel the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, either by expunging it altogether from our

formularies, or by making the Church teach and deny it in the same breath.

There is this fundamental difference to be noted between the Nicene and the Baptismal Memorialists. The first ask simply for a rectification of the Text of the Creed, not even its formal incorporation in the Prayer Book. This granted, they demand no further changes in the Liturgy, or Articles, or elsewhere ; though they might not oppose them if broached by others. Their wishes denied, they make no threats of secession ; nor is it probable that the utter failure of their plans would drive a single one of them out of the Anglican Communion. If the Church is to be controlled by fear rather than by love, their cause is therein the weaker.

But the dullest observer of "the signs of the times" must discern that the baptismal question is but "the beginning of the end." Baptismal Regeneration once abolished from our formularies, "Priest," "Altar," "Sacrifice," "Absolution," must follow in rapid succession, until every vestige of the "Sacramental System" shall have been abolished from the Prayer Book, and the Church reduced to the dogmatic level and ritual "Use" of Hanover, or Put-in-Bay. Whether this would be a "consummation devoutly to be wished," or the utter ruin of the Church, is not within the scope of the present Article to determine—we merely call attention to the fact. And besides all this, while the leaders of this movement are making these loud demands for such ceremonies, they are threatening schism in the Church. There is to be a great secession from our pale of the lovers of 'truth and purity,' a new and more glorious P. E. Church is to be founded with self-ordained Bishops, if no better material can be had ; since the new Zion is to repudiate "Apostolical Succession," as one of the figments of Popery. If the friends of this movement are as numerous as they are loud spoken, the situation is a very grave one. We are asked to change the fundamental doctrine of the Church, or else to lose a certain number of our children ; at the very moment, when laying aside all partisan feuds, the Church in America should be bending all her energies to the great work of converting and evangelizing our vast continent.

We hope not to be thought lacking in due respect to that venerable and august body, our General Convention, if we venture to suggest that these great questions are above its province. They

are in no sense American and local; they concern the whole Anglican Communion, if not the entire Holy Catholic Church. We must not act in such a way as to compromise our brethren abroad. No argument told with more force against the Nicene Memorialists in the last Convention than this,—that it would not do to recite the Creed one way in America and another way in England. We can assure our friends of the Baptismal movement that the argument will be pressed home to *them*, and they must own the justice of it themselves. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is as precious or as odious to the English peer, or the converted Maori or Zulu, as it is to the American Churchman. If it is a "burden to the conscience" in our own country, it must be equally burdensome in Great Britain and South Africa and Australia. If it is a priceless heritage handed down to us from our fathers, Anglican Churchmen abroad cannot afford to let it be tampered with by rash American hands.

In an able and well written Pastoral by the Bishop of New York attention is drawn to the following fact, which the leaders of both movements would do well to ponder. It can hardly be gainsaid that the strong tendency in our American Communion is not toward diversity; but on the contrary toward greater uniformity with the Mother Church of England.

Immediately after the war of our Revolution the feeling of the country, even among Churchmen, was bitterly anti-English. The problem seemed to be, to depart as widely as possible from the offices of the Mother Church, without actually repudiating her Orders and Communion. Let any one who doubts this statement read carefully "The Proposed Book;" in which even the Nicene Creed was thrown overboard. Now, thank God! the current is setting strongly the other way. Unity is the watchword. The Lambeth Conference has been a powerful stimulus to this feeling. If "one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;" if one is honored, "all the members rejoice with it." Many intelligent and devout Churchmen are asking the questions, Why the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimitis* should not be restored to their proper place in the evensong of the Church? And what objection is there to the insertion of the *Athanasian Hymn* in the body of the Prayer Book, provided its use in divine service were made obligatory on no one? We may ere long look for powerful movements in

this direction, *i. e.* to secure for ourselves all that is really valuable in the Liturgy and Offices of the Mother Church. In the face of this popular, and by no means unreasonable feeling, the Memorialists of both parties must approach the General Convention and make their demands. They claim it as a matter of conscience with them, and there is no reason why we should doubt their word.

What answer will the Convention make? Will it be a decided negative? In the case of the Creed, we can conceive of but one negative, which would preclude all further action. That is a solemn declaration that we now possess the original *Œcuménical Symbol* of the undisputed councils, free from all error and interpolation. Such a declaration (like the definition of Papal Infallibility) must be made in the face of all historic truth; and is hardly likely to proceed from such a body as our conscientious and truth-loving General Convention.

Will the answer to the Baptismal Revisionists be a decided negative? Permit us, as one not interested in their cause, to urge a doubt as to the wisdom of such a course. Let us not forget that there are many who both think and write that a little exercise of Christian policy and forbearance would have saved to the Church of England both Wesley and Newman with their disciples. Let us not repeat the mistake by any rash or ill-advised action! But shall their prayer be granted? *Μή γένοτο.* What, make the Anglican Church a babbler? teaching one set of doctrines on one side of the Atlantic, and another on opposite shores! Is orthodoxy a thing of latitude and longitude, to be determined by the gulf stream? We can see no adequate remedy for the matter save in the words which stand at the head of this Article—a *Pan-Anglican Synod*—for the settlement of vexed questions.

When the South African Church felt the iron of heresy entering into her very soul, her cry was heard in England, and the result was the Lambeth Conference of 1867. There were those (especially the Erastians in England) who argued ill of the measure—its result was to be the ruin of the Church. Yet we see the result of that conference (restricted as was the sphere of its action) has been the strength, instead of the weakness of the Church.

We venture then in all humility, to suggest to the General Convention, that when these grave questions of fundamental doctrine shall come before it, it shall decline the decision of them; not as

a timid evasion of consequences, but with a call for a general synod or council of all Anglican Churches, to hear and to decide. That the response of the Archbishop to such a request from such a source would be favorable, who can doubt? If he refused, the responsibility of such a step would rest with him. The theatre of action in these matters would then be transferred to the whole Anglican Church, where it properly belongs. We can speak with some authority in the name of the Nicene memorialists, and say that they would be most happy to submit their question to such a tribunal. If after a careful and deliberate hearing the decision should be unfavorable to them, they could only (like Huss and Wycliffe), appeal to some future true and lawful Ecumenical Council of the Church, when the day for Christendom's reunion should arrive. But would the other party in like event submit? We should see by their action, whether they were loyal sons of the Church, or schismatics at heart. We are not in their counsels, and cannot tell what their line of action would be. But if the inevitable result of the agitation of this question be a schism, there is no reason why our little Missionary Church in the United States should bear the shock of division, alone and unaided by the Mother and Sister Churches. When the local Church of Alexandria was vexed by the clamor of Arius and his followers, all Christendom was summoned to the rescue; and it has ever been the fashion of the Church to appeal questions of general interest to the whole Body of Christ. Alas! that in these days of strife and division such a council cannot assemble!

Let us attempt a hasty sketch of our idea of a Pan-Anglican Synod. It should be composed, of course, of the BISHOPS of the Church of Christ. In accordance with primitive usage, absent Bishops might depute two or more godly and learned presbyters of their diocese to represent them as *legates*, and cast the vote of their diocese in their behalf. A few laymen, learned in ecclesiastical and secular law, might be admitted as *assessors*, to give the benefit of their advice in legal and canonical matters. An assembly thus constituted would truly represent the entire Anglican Church, and from its decisions there would be no appeal save to an Ecumenical Council. Perhaps once in *ten* years would not be too often for its regular assemblage. Of course at present, its decisions would not have the force of positive law; but the local

Churches could provide for the acceptance of its authority. Thus (*e. g.*) our General Convention could easily modify its constitution so as to give the force of law in the American Episcopal Church to the decisions of the Pan-Anglican Synod. We have seen how cordially the action of the Lambeth Conference was received in America.

One of the functions of the Synod would be the authoritative determination of the questions in doctrine which may arise in various branches of the Church. Priests, deacons and laymen should have the right of *petition*, and their prayers should be heard and determined in accordance with their importance and value. Thus, by the right of petition, every member of Christ would have a voice in the assembly; though it by no means follows that every petition should be read *in extenso* to the entire assembly. Another advantage of the Synod would be an approximation toward a *uniform Book of Common Prayer*. We have already remarked this tendency in America, and the same can be said of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. On the other hand we fear a tendency in the Church of Ireland and in some of the British colonies, in the opposite direction. The Pan-Anglican Synod would encourage the one and restrain the excesses of the other. We oftentimes wish that some slight and unimportant change *could* be made in our American Prayer Book, just to confound those who think that "dotting an *i* and crossing a *t*" is ruination, and that wisdom sleeps forever in the graves of our revolutionary veterans! The recent changes in our hymns have done something to avert "the cast-iron era" of the Church's history.

It is obvious that prayers for rules and services of a local nature must ever be provided for by national Churches. But we can see no reason why in all other respects we should not have *one general Book of Common Prayer*, wherever the English language is known; why the same lessons should not be read, and the same psalms and canticles be sung on both sides of the Atlantic. All that was best in the English, Scottish and American books, might thus be selected for common use. By our present law one General Convention must propose, and another adopt all changes in the Prayer Book. We would like it better were no change allowed, unless proposed by the Pan-Anglican Synod, and then ratified and adopted by the General Convention. And if the Synod met at

stated intervals, all mistakes and grievances could be easily remedied. We tender then this olive-branch to all who desire important changes—*let it be the act of the whole Church.* We implore our Right Reverend Fathers, and the venerable and learned men who are to sit in the House of Deputies, neither to decide questions which concern our entire communion at home and abroad; nor yet to spurn the petitions of Christian men, who are earnest, sincere and resolute in their purpose.

Let us have a Pan-Anglican Synod, and then “Let us have Peace;” but Peace only through *the Truth!*

ART. V.—A PLEA FOR A COMMENTARY FOR TO-DAY.

THE Study of the Parish Priest should be the work-shop for his Parish. There, at least, should be found really serviceable implements with which to work out the task of preparing homiletic instruction for his people.

But so far as our experience goes, there is yet wanting a compact serviceable Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures. There has been provided excellent material in the different notes, comments, and *catenæ* we have been able to examine. Splendid apparatus has been collected by the genius of some of the ablest and devoutest men of this age. But all this is yet raw material which has to be worked up by the Parish Priest himself, and then found to be more costly, than useful, for the daily and hourly needs of his people. Devout comments by St. Augustine, earnest exhortations by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, fine comments by St. Jerome, are well worth studying; but they are not directly applicable to the needs, more or less directly practical, and often controversial, of the Laity of to-day. We do not undervalue these aids. We would not imply that we would lessen the authority of the Fathers—rather we would exalt their claims: but the *isms* of to-DAY have to be fought, not the heresies catalogued by St. Irenæus or St. Epiphanius. And so far as our observation goes, there is no Commentary that will meet them by a direct issue.

Of course we do not mean that we have examined *all* the comments offered in late years, nor yet that we have examined those

which we use, almost daily, with exhaustive study. But daily use in the closet, and study, for parochial purposes, readily shows the defects as well as the excellencies of those most generally accessible, or which have won a deserved reputation. And again, there are certain crucial *tests* which each Teacher applies, perhaps unconsciously, perhaps positively, to the Commentary presented to his notice. These tests vary with the grasp he has of the dogmatic teaching of the Bible, or with his apprehension of the heresies, or errors, afloat in the community in which he labors, and of the consequent needs of his congregation. For the precise statement then of those truths—distinct and positive which he has to present—he should be able to turn to his Commentary, and find them stated with reference to their opposite errors. It might be objected that error is ever changing; that its phase to-day is different from that of yesterday and will be different from that of to-morrow; that the boast that Creeds are useless renders any refutation useless, except the clear enunciation, as a blast from a trumpet of the Creed itself. True, but a comment, that would apply to the false teaching current for a single decade, would go far to modify, and correct, the popular apprehension of these errors for the next decade. And that would be a great gain. The pulpit is the last place where those that hold error should be denounced by name. But the pulpit should be the chief place where these errors should be exposed, and branded, with the proofs of their just sinful consequences. There if any where the maxim, of condemning the sin, but sparing the sinner should be followed. But the pages of a Commentary are different. There the arena is changed, and the tenets of the different sects can be rightly spoken of with relation to their authors, and present defenders; courteously but positively. This is true liberality, right charity; for the truth is the only charity we should know; and its enunciation, as sufficient for all men, is the divine liberality.

The need then in the study of the Preacher and in the library, both of the Parish, and of the Parishioner, is a Comment for to-day compact, clear, concise, filled with the germs of the doctrinal teaching to be expanded in the pulpit: by which the intelligent layman can receive that primary training which will render the deductions and conclusions of the sermon familiar to him as he listens in the Church. It should unwrap the present application of the precious

words of the Prophetic Scripture. We would apply this word Prophetic in its larger sense of 'teaching with a purpose of providing for future as well as present needs.' And so it would include nearly the whole Bible—certainly the larger part of the New Testament. And a comment properly prepared would show how past principles, even in the delicate phraseology that expresses them, apply most closely to the combining needs of present religious development. For as human nature varies within given limits, and its immediate phase is contingent on the mode of its civilisation, yet it is ever the same at root,—so Revelation varies in its applications, yet is ever one. But the Church too is ever the same, while she rises in each age to the needs of the hour, and presents, in suitable garb, the unchanging truths she has received, and earnestly defends. The Tracts of St. Cyprian, the Lectures of St. Cyril, the Sermons of St. Augustine, the Homilies of the Reformation, the Sermons of Bishop Taylor, Dr. South, Dr. Barrow, Bp. Bull, are admirable, are full of deep thought; but they do not supply the present need of Liddon's Bampton Lectures, or of Bp. Moberly's able works. The times have changed. What is positive in their exegesis is of permanent value. The garb in which they clothed it has changed its fashion. Lord Bacon showed never so clearly his practical common sense as when he commended so highly the Body of Divinity then extant in the daily Sermons of the Church of England. We may echo his remarks in behalf of the usefulness of the Pulpit of to-day. Yet it does not come up to the argument of its Divine Theme, as it could, had the preacher living fruit presented to him to pluck for feeding his congregation instead of the conserves, rich, rare, costly, of past ages. The student in his closet can find them very nourishing, but they are dainties palatable to the soul fed by longer and more vigorous study of the sacred text than is to be found generally among our Laity.

The sacred text itself gives more present food. For it teaches immediate applications of fixed truth. Take an example, where the prophecy, the direct application, and the variation in time, all lie side by side. In the parable of the Drag Net, there is the prophecy for all future time. There was the direct application in the work of the Fishers of Galilee. There is the present application in the daily fulfilment of the work of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The last fifty years have been more fruitful in accurately reproducing the text of the New Testament than any previous three hundred. Workers in this department have won high distinction, and we have now more living authorities laboring in this toil of love than can be mentioned in any two past generations. Bishops Wordsworth and Ellicott, Dr. Tregelles, Dr. Tischendorf, have gained proud titles. But in spite of the direct labors of the first two and of others there is needed the serviceable commentary which we have tried to suggest. There are defects in each, as also in the otherwise admirable works (on the Gospels alone) of Dr. Williams and Dr. Burdon.

We repeat we need a Commentary that will deal directly and concisely with the mistakes, and confusions and heresies, of the popular phases of the religious bodies of this day and will counterstate the Catholic doctrine.

It should meet the Romanist squarely upon the issues he endeavors to force from the words of Scripture. It should deal with the Immersion theory of the Baptists; with the Pelagianism of modern Methodism; with the Fatalism of the Calvinist; with the semi-infidelity of the Unitarian and Universalist. It should show the orthodoxy and Catholicity of the Prayer Book. It should direct attention to the distortions and dislocations of the proof texts which the different sectaries usually make.

We cannot test the Commentaries we have mentioned upon all these subjects. But we can readily see that they are deficient in many of them. For instance, we have not yet found the Commentator who shows that the famous text for immersion (Rom. vi.) does not necessarily bear the violent interpretation, the Baptist puts upon it. It seems to us that the XXVIIth ode in the I. Bk. of Horace, would throw light upon St. Paul's use of the word 'buried' and lead the student to avoid the extreme conclusion the Baptist seeks to force from it. Even such a scholar as Maskel in his curious work on Lay Baptism yields it. And so opposite a thinker as Maurice in his Kingdom of CHRIST, acquiesces in this distorted use and attempts to soften the deductions sought from it. The point is this: Immersion was usual, but, by the very metaphor St. Paul uses, it could not be stringently administered in that form in *all* cases. Therefore the common opinion of what should be absolutely necessary for a burial, as the heathen teaches, would throw light upon a simile, used by the apostle, and addressed to a

mingled gathering of Judaic and Gentile converts, whose usages varied so much in this very custom of burial.

But even where we might expect positive teaching there too we are disappointed. For at least upon the claims of the Church to a true Catholicity and Apostolicity we ought to find something definite. But even in Wordsworth the author of the *THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS* we find this defect. It is assumed, of course, and readily enough, but it is not formally announced in passages where it might be expected. Let us test the Commentaries at hand by this touchstone in the crucial tests. We have before us, Wordsworth's Notes, Williams on the Gospels, and the Plain Commentary. At our elbow are D'Oyle and Mant, and Scott, the venerable, and ponderous. These we believe to be the most usual aids to the Text our clergy use. Before we press our objections let us record our highest admiration for the excellencies of the first three works and our respect for the other two. None of them need commendation from us. It would be useless and impertinent; but we choose to express our admiration that we may not be thought disrespectful towards those to whom we really pay a high reverence. Nor are we reviewing them as Commentaries but simply using them to illustrate the defects in the ordinary materials for exegesis which they supply.

Let us take a few texts from the Gospels as proof texts to test the correctness of our remarks. We will select first those texts where the authority of the Church is taught. Next where the authority of the ministry is enforced. And where there is positive instruction when these two are presupposed. If space then remains we will test Wordsworth's Notes on the Epistles. We will see that where we would expect decisive teaching it is not given. Yet we cannot think, in the face of contrary facts, that those Doctors would shrink from teaching the 'Truth, the whole Truth and nothing but the Truth.'

Let us select.

(a) St. Matt. xviii. 15-17. "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." The culminating verse is of course the 17th.

Upon this Wordsworth has this very unsatisfactory note—unsatisfactory because it leaves so much unsaid. “Our Lord had commanded His disciples not to give offence and to cut off what is most dear—to separate from our nearest friend—if he offends us, *i. e.* causes us to sin. But lest they should proceed hastily and haughtily in this matter, He prescribes the course which they must pursue in the exercise of discipline. He calls the sinner their *brother*, and commands them to deal with him privately at first, and if he hearkens to them and confesses his sin, then he does not say, thou hast inflicted punishment or obtained satisfaction but thou *hast gained thy brother*. And the more refractory he may be, the more eager thou must also be, as a patient and tender physician, for the restoration of his spiritual health. If one remedy fails, try another, and another. Take with thee one or two more, that it may be manifest that thou art ready to do all on thy part that may conduce to amendment and restoration. But if he will not hear them tell it to the Church, that through fear of being cast out of the Church by excommunication, and of the binding in Heaven, consequent on it, he may be so shamed and lay aside his malice. Our Lord threatens the sinner with these punishments, in order that he may repent and escape them. Hence he does not cut off the sinner at once from the Church but establishes a first, a second and a third tribunal in order that if he refuse to hear the first, he may hearken to the second or the third, and if he have no reverence for that, he may stand in awe of the future judgment of God. (*Chrys.*)

“17 (*τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*) to the Church. Our Lord had already prepared His Apostles for the use of this word *ἐκκλησίᾳ* (see above xvi. 18,) to describe the Visible Society of his faithful people. He had informed them who were to bear office publicly in it for the exercise of Godly discipline therein. (Comp. 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Tim. v. 20) in His name and for the general good.” *

Then follows several references to Augustine, Chrysostom, Hooker and Hammond on the mode and measure of administering reproof, public and private. That on Hooker alone we could compare, and that was the discussion on Auricular Confession in Bk. VI. ch. 4, and is stronger than Wordsworth. Now let us quote the Plain Commentary. On 15th and 16th verses the comment is of the same tenor as Wordsworth.

But on 17th. And if he neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church:—This is that rebuke “*before all*” of which St. Paul speaks in his First Epistle to Timothy:—but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. By which words our LORD is clearly giving rules for conduct *among Christians*. He alludes to wrongs sustained *within His Church* and speaks of that Church as armed with powers of her own—powers which are accordingly found in full operation in St. Paul’s time! The consequence of “neglect to hear the Church” (as this saying of our LORD clearly implies) can be none other than exclusion from Church membership; being cut off from the body of the faithful. Not that a man becomes thereby excluded

from the Church's sympathy: but by becoming like 'a heathen man (one of those for whose Repentance and Conversion the Church toils night and day)—he loses every privilege to which Baptism entitled him. And let none suppose that excommunication is a vain decree for—'"

Then the comment goes on to ver. 18. This is better, yet short of what we hope to show the verses demand. Let us next take Williams on this passage (*Ministry*, 2nd year).

"*But if he neglect to hear them, or literally to hear amiss, tell it to the Church.* These words imply a visible society to hear and to speak, and with power to excommunicate or absolve; an allusion very intelligible to the Apostles, as it was a power now exercised by the Jewish Synagogue, and taken from them and conferred by CHRIST HIMSELF on His Church, which is to be the end. *But if he neglect to hear even the Church, let him be unto thee as the heathen man and the publican* (Matt.) Yet not that charity even here is to be at an end: for St. Augustine in his Sermon on this passage, 'Though we esteem him no longer as a brother, yet, not on that account is his salvation to be neglected. For even the Heathen we consider not as our brethren, yet for their salvation we always seek.'

There is after this a beautiful passage, but no wise bearing on the point we would bring out. Now these verses to our mind bear very well a comment, including these points. (a) The passage in itself, this the three furnish very well, but (b) the true parallel in 1 Cor. vi. 1-3 vs. (c) The Church's office as peacemaker. (d) The Church is the ultimate authoritative Arbiter in all such cases, from whose decision in the nature of the case there can be no appeal; though this authority is derived from her LORD and to be exercised under HIM. These points decisively stated in few words would be of more real value than the generalizations quoted above.

The next passage we would select is,

(b) Matt. x. 41. He that receiveth you receiveth ME, and he that receiveth ME receiveth HIM that sent ME.

Wordsworth bestows no comment at all upon it; but has rather a full one on the *next* verse, and an unsatisfactory one on the parallel place in St. John xiii. 20. Williams likewise gives only this to the verse:

"And now in the more immediate application of all this to the sending forth of the Apostles. 'He that receiveth you receiveth ME, and he that receiveth ME receiveth HIM that sent ME!—an expression often used on different occasions, and also with some variation, as 'He that heareth you heareth ME,' and 'He that seeth ME seeth HIM that sent ME.'"

The Plain Commentary adds nothing but this, "A marvellous saying!" "Surely the sayings of our LORD, which are found to have been frequently on His lips, (and there are many such) deserve to be most attentively considered." But on the two following verses it bestows a tolerable consideration. Now the verse *is* most important, but why the learned Doctors should shrink from drawing the most obvious deductions from it, we cannot understand. To us, the verse is a most solemn one, to which the Laity should give great heed; and it, too, contains a warning to the clergy, to remember whose ambassadors they are. A concise comment upon it is needful for us, at this sect-plagued day, for it involves, in its pregnant wording, the real authority and power of the clergy. It would appear from the complaints that are brought to us that England, too, is not by any means so well grounded in this Truth that the Church can lay aside her declaration of its meaning by proper comments.

(c) We would next refer in general terms to the last discourse of our LORD, given in St. John's gospel. To us they are a perfect storehouse of positive dogmatic teaching. HE there gives to the Eleven undoubting and clear instruction upon the Unity of the Church, and the office of the HOLY GHOST. It has been our practice always to refer those seeking the Church to a close and devout study of these chapters; and, we believe, always with profit to their spiritual insight of the Work and Mission of CHRIST's mystical body. But Wordsworth comments upon it generally in a devotional tone, scarcely touching at all upon the doctrinal teaching involved, at least, where it brings in, directly or indirectly, the office of the Church as an organic body. And especially is this the case in the solemn xvii. chapter. He does not seem to apprehend the grand undertone of the unity and continuity of the Church, which pervade this great intercessional Prayer, from its first words to the last. The Plain Commentary is somewhat better and succinct upon this subject; but it is far from satisfactory. Unfortunately our set of Williams' Commentary is defective in the volume on Holy Week, but from the references in the Plain Commentary it can scarcely differ in tenor from the other two.

It may be objected that these commentators do not write professedly a dogmatic and doctrinal exposition, but a devotional one. The plea may perhaps be admitted in behalf of Dr. Williams and

Dr. Burgon, but hardly for Bishop Wordsworth. His position has been too clearly and continuously controversial, and his Commentary contains too many doctrinal discussions, especially against Romish misrepresentations, to make that plea of any avail. But he makes no effort to meet the same evils which infest England as well as this country, and which have risen clamorously into such political importance that they threaten the disestablishment of the English Church. Thus it seems to us the like evils necessitate the like remedies which we are endeavoring to set forth as required practically here. The remedies can be compacted into a clear, concise, dogmatic teaching of Catholic doctrine, and a short, courteous and suggestive refutation of common schismatic, and heretical expositions. We claim that no amount of essays and volumes, slight or thorough, popular or scientifically theologic, partial or exhaustive, can supply or replace this necessity. A sentence there read in the connections, the sacred context supply, is worth ten pages of controversy. A definition or a deduction, legitimate and upon Catholic authority, studied under the texts it elucidates in the Bible, is worth fifty pages elsewhere.

Now we have really no exposition which rises to the height of the Church's exigencies to-day. The Fathers wrote for their own day. We must write for ours. Therefore every generation will demand a new exposition; new in meeting the varied shades of opposition or of feeling which are peculiar to each age; old in that it declares the unchanging continuity of the doctrine as well as the authority of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Therefore the ancient expositors should be carefully studied, and their opinions stated. But we do not need, for the use of the Laity, that the Notes should be wholly from them. It is yielding the field of exposition almost entirely to schismatic works. For the mass of the Laity have little training fitting them to sympathize in Patristic expositions, but they *have* for clear nervous expositions in modern style. Let the Church be true to her trust. She has in this country men skilled enough to do her this service. She demands it. It is a tool for her work as necessary as the axe, saw, plane, and hammer of the carpenter. With such a comment, cheap and accessible, in the hands of her priests, (whether in parishes or in the mission field) which they can supply to their congregations, she can do double the work she does now;

for many who would not look at a tract or a defence of the Church and her claims, would readily read a comment. Her refutations would be far more convincing, for the false expositions would be refuted by the very context quite as much as by any argument, as soon as attention was drawn to the position of the passage. And the argument itself would be more powerful there than in the pages of a set essay.

Finally, we deem the need for such a Commentary imperative. The religious needs of the people demand that they should be supplied, and two sets of annotations are readily met with already. Either those which, professing to be in favor of no particular creed, emasculate their notes of all that can ever make them of the slightest value; or those which, filled with narrow and shallow exegeses that conveniently pass over difficult or annoying texts, are crammed with defences of some favorite sect. Either of these two find a ready sale. Is not the Church then called upon *now* to come forward and by like means vindicate her claims to be the Keeper and Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures for the masses? If we are right in urging that there is such a demand, which the Church has the men and the resources to supply, then we may point out, as a last remark, the line such a Commentary should follow. The fixed purposes in view should be in parallel lines to the popular errors. First, to illustrate and enforce the Creed. Secondly, to present, at the proper passages, such decisive and lucid instruction upon the mission, constitution and authority of the Church of CHRIST as may be practicable and practical, and to supply condensed arguments for common use. Third, to supply also direct disproof, as may be convenient, of popular delusions in religion which are based upon false or perverted teaching from distorted and mangled texts. We would by no means exclude the authority of the Fathers, but we would rather seek our sources in Waterland and Leslie and Bull, and Browne and Liddon—themselves grounded upon Patristic bases, but deeply engaged in the discussions of their several times. The coloring they would give to such an exposition as we know we need for ourselves and our own work, would be more popular with the Laity than one that was steeped in the beauty (to many so inappreciated yet really so devout and reverent) of Augustine's or Bernard's choicest eloquence.

ART. VI.—THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.*

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

WE have before noticed the progress of St. Paul's labors after the Council of Jerusalem to the time of his arriving at Derbe, and meeting Timothy. The latter was the son of a Jewish woman who believed, and was well reported of by the brethren at Lystra and Iconium. St. Paul chose him as a companion, and circumcised him. Shortly after they came to Thessalonica. (Acts xvii. 1.) When St. Paul was sent away from Berea, Silas and Timotheus abode there still. (xvii. 14.) When the Apostle had gone from Athens to Corinth, Silas and Timotheus came to him from Macedonia. (xviii. 1-5.) There was an abode of eighteen months at Corinth. First and Second Thessalonians were there written. Timothy and Sylvanus unite with St. Paul in the Address of each. In the Second Epistle Timothy is called "our brother and minister of God, and a fellow-laborer in the Gospel;" he had sent him to establish them in the faith.

Both Epistles were written from Corinth, during the eighteen months; and Dr. Davidson and others think that the Second was written about a year after the First. (*Introd.*, p. 449.)

Between the time of the Selection of Timothy, and the residence at Corinth, (a period probably of about a year), Timothy must have been ordained. We may assume that it took place at Lystra, and St. Paul allowed the Elders there to join with him in the imposition of hands.

We regard it as a settled point that there was but one ordination of Timothy; that it was conferred by the Apostle, the Elders, by his sanction, uniting in it. (*Ellicott's Past. Ep.*, p. 125. Dr. McKnight *apud Hobart's Apology*, p. 155; *Lange, 1 Timothy*, 53; 2 *Ibid.* 85 notes; *Watson's Theolog. Inst.*, *Methodist Church*, part 4, chap. 1.) One and the same transaction is referred to in 1st Timothy, iv. 14, and in 2d Timothy, i. 6.

An obscurity which Lange calls "a gap, not a difficulty," oc-

* Continued from the July Number.

Errata.—On page 266, line 53, for *Levitical* read *critical*. And on page 278, for *Asiatic* read *Adriatic*.

curs, viz: whether Timothy was sent from Athens to the Thessalonians, as the text literally indicates. The solution is, that he had been directed to go there from Berea.* After the expiration of the eighteen months and more spent at Corinth, St. Paul departed to go into Syria, to keep the Passover at Jerusalem. (Acts xviii. 18, 21.) Priscilla and Aquila are mentioned as going with him. Timothy is not.

From this time until First Corinthians was written, we have no trace of Timothy in any part of the Scriptures. This embraces a period of about three years.

Then we have in that First Epistle the following passages: "For this cause I have sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which are in Christ, *as I teach everywhere in every church.*" (1 Cor. iv. 17.) "Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear, for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do. Let no man, therefore, despise him. Conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me." (Ibid. xvi. 10.) "I look for him with the brethren," or, "I and the brethren look for him."† (Ibid. 11.)

It is almost universally admitted, that this Epistle was written from Ephesus, and during the last year of the residence of three years there. It seems to indicate that Timothy was there with the Apostle, yet he may have received directions to visit Corinth, when at some other place. Two deductions are plain and important. Timothy's ministrations were such as to bring in remembrance St. Paul's ways in Christ, "as he taught everywhere." His high station in the church is thus established. Next his visit to the Corinthians was to be short, and he was to return, or come, to the Apostle at Ephesus.

That between the date of the Second of Thessalonians and the First of Corinthians, this "fellow-laborer in the Gospel" was inactive, cannot be supposed. His field of labor is undisclosed.

We are warranted in saying that he came to Ephesus after First Corinthians was written, and the following texts enable us to

* Conybeare and Howson, vol. 1, p. 507. Davidson, 2, 442. Lange, 1st Thessalonians.

† Whitby.

follow him somewhat further. “Paul purposing in spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go into Jerusalem, sent two of those who ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus, into Macedonia; but he himself stayed in Asia for a season.” (Acts xix. 21, 22.)

“Now I will come unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia, for I do pass through Macedonia. It may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you.” (1 Corinth. xvi. 5, 6.)

“After the uproar was ceased, Paul departed to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and given them much exhortation, he came into Greece.” (Acts xx. 1, 2.)

“As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went (*was about going*) into Macedonia.”—(1 Timothy i. 3.) “Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and Timothy our brother unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia.” (2 Corinthians, i. 1.) This was written from Macedonia.

We deduce from these texts—

(1) That Timothy upon his return from Corinth, had been sent into Macedonia before St. Paul went there.

(2) That they were again together at Ephesus, and St. Paul requested him to remain there, when he was about going into Macedonia. The Apostle went thither.

(3) That a short time after this, Timothy is found with St. Paul in Macedonia, unites with him there in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and probably went with him into Greece. He was with him in the ensuing spring, when the Apostle left Greece to go into Asia by way of Macedonia.

Allow two suppositions, and we have a narrative thoroughly consistent, a sequence of events entirely harmonious, and can give full force to every statement to the letter. One is a short visit of Timothy to Macedonia and a return to Ephesus, before St. Paul departed. The other, a short residence at Ephesus after the Apostle's departure, and then rejoining him in Macedonia.

We have two clear proofs that Timothy was employed by St. Paul in missions and labors of brief duration. When the latter went from Berea into Greece, he and Sylvanus were left at Berea, directed to go to Thessalonica, and in a short time joined St. Paul at Corinth. The visit from Ephesus or some other place to Corinth, before noticed, was unquestionably short. We find that Titus

was sent with a brother to the Corinthians.* Apollos was also delegated for missions. In short we find, what the state of the Church would lead us to infer, that as exigencies arose in particular places, and the personal action of the Apostle was impossible or difficult, some one was deputed for the special purpose. This visit of Timothy to Macedonia may have been for some temporary object. We can scarcely doubt that the one to Corinth was special and brief.

But this supposition (of a return to Ephesus) is opposed by several Commentators. Its rejection is involved in their theory, that the Epistle was written between two imprisonments. Dr. Davidson cites Berthold and Hemsen, and Wiesinger adds Matthies and Huther as refuting it.

We have not been able to obtain the works of Berthold or Hemsen. But Huther has been carefully examined, and he informs us of the views of Matthies, and also of Berthold.

Huther, himself, advocates the Interval theory for the Epistles.

But he says that many Commentators, among them Berthold and Matthies, hold, that after Timothy had gone into Macedonia he did not go to Corinth as was intended, but returned to Ephesus, and there received the directions contained in the first four verses. The Apostle then left for Macedonia. Timothy soon followed him, and went with him to Corinth. Timothy was sent to Ephesus from Corinth before the Apostle left for Asia. St. Paul wrote his Epistle after his departure, and from Corinth, or while he was traveling from that place to Macedonia.

Now we observe that these critics find no difficulty in assuming that Timothy was but a short time in Macedonia, and returned to St. Paul at Ephesus, and received the first directions there before St. Paul's departure; nor do they find any difficulty in supposing that he soon rejoined the Apostle in Macedonia.

And we may add, that the numerous writers who support the theory of the Epistle being written from Macedonia after St. Paul went there subsequent to the riot, concede the same fact, of Timothy's return to Ephesus. (*Townsend's Notes*, 353.)

The conjecture that Timothy was, in this mission to Macedonia,

* 2 Corinthians, xii. 18.

to proceed to Corinth, is, we apprehend, untenable. Wiesinger assumes that he was to go to Corinth, (citing 1 Cor. iv. 17,) and presses the argument that he had not time to go there, to fulfill his mission, and return to the Apostle, within the period we can reasonably assign for the continued abode of the latter at Ephesus. But we think it is sufficiently clear, that this visit to Corinth was at an earlier period of the three years than this to Macedonia, though probably not long before. We find as facts, that the Corinthians were informed Timothy was to visit them. They are distinctly requested to conduct him forth in peace, that he may come to the Apostle; that St. Paul and the brethren looked for him. This was written at Ephesus. And then we find Timothy at that place, and sent to Macedonia. Timothy thus finished this mission to Corinth, and came to Ephesus.

Undoubtedly the view of Berthold and others, that Timothy preceded the Apostle from Corinth after the three months' abode and went to Ephesus, and there received the Epistle, is fully refuted by Huther. The narrative (Acts xx. 3, 6), is explicit that Timothy and the others accompanied the Apostle into Asia. We are warranted in concluding that they sailed together from Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, to Philippi. There the others left St. Paul for Troas, and after the Passover he joined them there.

As to the immediate question we are considering, Huther says: "Still more untenable are the hypotheses of Paulus, that the Epistle was written during the Apostle's residence at Cæsarea; of Schemerburgher, that it was written in Jerusalem during the period mentioned in Acts xxi. 26, (the days of the Purification); of Bottger, in Patara, or in Miletus. Against all these hypotheses, exists one fact, that they require an arbitrary interpretation of the passage in 1st Timothy i. 3. If we will not consent to an arbitrary exegesis, and must cling to the hypothesis that the letter was written during the time covered by the Acts of the Apostles, there must be this assumption, that the journey from Ephesus to Macedonia, mentioned in 1st Timothy i. 3, when Timothy was left behind, occurred during the three years' stay at Ephesus, but that St. Luke has not mentioned it." This is treated, of course, as distinct from the visit after the uproar. This assumption Huther proceeds to combat.

The arbitrary exegesis spoken of, or one branch of it, is this—

that the account in Acts refers to the same occurrence as that mentioned in 1st Timothy i. 3. This position these writers hold to be inadmissible. Thus Huther says, "All these circumstances prove that the journey of the Apostle from Ephesus to Macedonia, mentioned in the Acts, was not the same as that spoken of by him in 1st Timothy i. 3."

Huther's arguments upon this point, except that of St. Luke's omission to notice the return of Timothy, are directed against the fact of the Epistle being written in Macedonia, and do not touch the point that the departure from Ephesus for Macedonia, referred to in both narratives, was the same event. Bearing this very important distinction in view, we collate the statements.

From Acts we find, that St. Paul intending to go through Macedonia and Achaia to Jerusalem, sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia. He abode in Asia yet a season. At its close the riot caused by Demetrius arose. He then departed to go into Macedonia. He went over those parts, and then into Greece. The statement in 1 Timothy i. 3, is, When I was about going into Macedonia from Ephesus, I besought you to tarry still at Ephesus. So we have entire consonance in the intention to go to Macedonia, the actual departure, and not a shadow of inconsistency if we allow the reasonableness of a presumption that Timothy had returned during the *season* before St. Paul's departure. When we again advert to the vast number of Commentators who upon differing theories as to the Epistle, concede or assume this fact, we may aver that no theory exacts so little of conjecture as this.

Treating this as established, we next find Timothy with the Apostle in Macedonia, with him in Greece subsequently, and probably going with him to Greece from Macedonia.

This brings us to the consideration of the other supposition, that of the stay of Timothy at Ephesus, before he joined the Apostle in Macedonia being short. This is of some difficulty; and we shall endeavor to meet it. It is urged, if we take the departure of St. Paul from Ephesus as being about Pentecost (June) and that he wintered in Greece, being there three months, we can only allow six or seven months for his labors in Macedonia and journey to Greece. As Timothy joined him while in Macedonia, in time to unite in Second Corinthians, we cannot suppose that Timothy remained in Ephesus after the Apostle's departure more than three

or four months. But this time would be wholly insufficient for the task and office given him in the Epistle. They required a permanent or at least a very long abode.

We submit in reply.

The language abide still, "tarry on," rather indicates a temporary than a long residence. Dr. Ellicott appears to favor this view, when he says that if the present infinitive had been used (Acts xiv. 22,) the contemplated duration of Timothy's stay at Ephesus would have been more especially marked. In the present case no inference can be safely drawn (*Pastoral Letters*, 21. n).

But chiefly, the objection rests upon the confusing the recital of what had been previously requested, and first allotted to Timothy, with the general enlarged commission given in the Epistle. The two verses after the address, (the third and fourth) are distinct from the rest, referring to something which had taken place before, and had been before directed. "Even as I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia, in order that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine, nor give ear to fables and genealogies which minister questions, rather than godly edifying, which is faith—" This is rehearsed as what had then been directed, and all that had been directed or declared.

Then come the expressive words, *so do*, or according to Dr. Ellicott, *so I do now*. In a note to 1 Timothy (Lange, 1869, p. 17,) the Rev. Mr. Harwood renders the passage, "So now also I exhort thee." It is stated that the ablest Commentators agree in this.

It is impossible not to see the limited and inferior character of the evils to be averted by this first residence of Timothy. Some were to be charged to teach nothing but the true doctrine, not to attend to fables which led to curious unedifying speculations. To effect these objects neither a long abode, nor great powers were demanded.

But consider the residue of the Epistle, when the request is turned almost into a command. The Apostle speaks of the glorious gospel committed to his trust, that he had been counted faithful, and put into the ministry, and then—"This charge I commit unto thee son Timothy."

Then follow rules for his guidance in the future. The Epistle

is a great commission and the law of its exercise. It confers a large portion of Apostolic power and functions. It develops evils far more startling and menacing than before existed. It speaks of those who had made shipwreck of their faith. It predicts that some should depart from it, giving heed to the doctrine of devils. Then we have a series of rules as to the qualifications of a Bishop and Deacon; and Timothy is told that all this was to teach him how he might behave himself in the House of God—how govern the Church. He was to command, as well as to teach. He was to ordain Elders. He was to discriminate between Elders who ruled well (especially such as labored in the word and doctrine) and others. He was authorized to hear accusations against Elders. All now indicates a state of riper evils, and greater advancement, demanding higher powers and a more permanent abode, than what is pointed out in the first four verses.

We hold it both reasonable and probable, that all the objects of the first request had been fulfilled by an abode of a few months at Ephesus, and a greater need for his services in Macedonia led to his rejoining the Apostle there.

If this view of the succession of events can be sustained; if Timothy after a temporary abode at Ephesus for such temporary purposes, did again join the Apostle in Macedonia; then it seems almost a demonstration that the Epistle could not have been written from that place, on this visit. It is certain that Timothy was with him when he left Greece for Asia by Macedonia, at the end of the three months' residence. It is reasonable to suppose, that he accompanied St. Paul from Macedonia to Greece. We find him with St. Paul in the former place, and no trace of his being elsewhere, within the time necessary for the journey and those three months.

St. Paul then after such residence, being prevented from sailing into Syria, went by way of Macedonia. (Acts xx. 3). We trace Timothy with him, certainly to Troas in that journey. (Ibid. 4).

The Apostle went from Troas to Assos, to Mytilene, to Miletus, where he met with the Elders of Ephesus; thence to Ptolemais or Cæsarea, then to Jerusalem, where he was arrested, and the two years' confinement at Cæsarea began.

Now as we find Timothy and the Apostle together at Troas, and are without a trace of such a union from that time until the im-

prisonment at Rome about three years after, we are left to conjecture where Timothy was in the interval. No theory can be more plausible than that he was left in Asia Proper, at some place along the coast, in the vicinity of Ephesus.

What we have stated and suggested excludes the idea of the Epistle being written at any time before St. Paul's separation from Timothy at Troas.

But there is another argument fatal we think to the supposition of the Epistle being before that event. Within a few days after leaving Troas the Apostle was at Miletus. He summoned the Elders of Ephesus to meet him there. He then delivered his farewell impressive sermon for their comfort and guidance. Now can it be imagined, that if the First Epistle had then been written, and the great commission given to Timothy, not a word should be found in this address referring to him? Timothy was delegated to govern the Church, at any rate during the Apostle's absence, and with ample powers. The latter was leaving the Elders with the apprehension of never seeing them again. Every reason which could have existed for conferring the power was likely to become more pressing and forcible. It is idle to suppose a revocation of an authority assumed to have been conferred some months before in Macedonia. And yet Timothy, and his position and sway in their Church,—Timothy just left, possibly present, is never referred to. Such an omission is consistent with the temporary and inferior authority bestowed by St. Paul upon his departure into Macedonia; but is inconceivable upon the supposition of the Epistle being written before this meeting at Miletus.

Again, how can the following argument be answered?

Timothy was left at Ephesus when the Apostle went into Macedonia. He was in Macedonia when Second Corinthians was written. This first Epistle then, if written in Macedonia, must have been written before Second Corinthians. It presupposes St. Paul and Timothy to be separated. Then the injunction to remain at Ephesus, renewed in the Epistle, was disobeyed. We cannot suppose the extreme improbability that Timothy had left Ephesus before it arrived.

We have traced the course of the Apostle to the arrest at Jerusalem, and imprisonment at Caesarea. If the Epistle was not written before the meeting at Miletus, it is scarcely possible that

it could have been before that imprisonment. That lasted two years. Believing the interval theory wholly untenable, as we shall seek hereafter to show, there is no period in the life of the Apostle to which the Epistle can be assigned with greater probability of truth, than during this residence at Cæsarea.

We are aware that in this view, we encounter the great authority of Dr. Davidson; as well as of several German Commentators, (See *Introd.* III. 14) Wiesinger refers to Huther as disproving it. Their leading arguments will be hereafter noticed.

In the first place there is nothing in the narrative of the imprisonment inconsistent with the supposition. There are several circumstances favoring it.

Although St. Paul was delivered into the custody of a centurion, yet he was allowed liberty, and his acquaintance were not to be forbidden to minister or come unto him. (Acts xxiv).

If we have succeeded in excluding any date for the Epistle prior to the meeting of the Elders at Miletus, this is the first period which can be assigned for it. There was at Cæsarea leisure and opportunity; and no date is suggested we believe by any author, between this imprisonment, and the interval period, five to six years after.

While the Epistle was clearly subsequent to the first request to remain at Ephesus, the language does not indicate the length of time between that request and its renewal; a few months only is required for the events which occurred between the meeting at Miletus and the beginning of this imprisonment.

The two great provinces of St. Paul's ministrations were Achaia with Crete, and Asia Proper. He had provided for the former by the commission to Titus. Just as soon as it became probable that he could not give a personal supervision, or that this would be long delayed, he would provide for the government, perpetuation, and faith of the Churches of his planting. He constitutes, therefore, what Wiesinger calls, An Apostolic Delegate, to meet the emergency.

Should he revisit the place, his authority would of course be superior. In the interval that conferred was to be ample. Now at Cæsarea, he had good grounds for a hope of ultimate release. Felix had trembled at his preaching, and dismissed him: at a convenient season he would hear him again. He would have been

released by Agrippa, had he not appealed unto Caesar.* That appeal was induced by an aversion to being tried by Festus at Jerusalem for offences against the Jewish law.†

Thus we find him in the Epistle expressing the hope of seeing Timothy "shortly," or "sooner than I anticipated,"‡ and then again, not relinquishing hope, but conscious that the event might be far off, he says; "but if I tarry long, thou mayest know how to behave thyself in the house of God;" giving the reason for conferring power and imposing commands.

And what can we suppose were the meditations of the Apostle during two inactive years at Caesarea, circumscribed on the one side by the Great Sea, on the other by the sweep of Carmel? The sudden and wonderful magnificence of the first Colony of the Flavian family would not dazzle or engross him.§ Often must his thoughts have dwelt upon the scenes of his former labors; upon the Churches of Macedonia and Greece planted by him; above all upon that grand field of his ministry, Asia Minor, and Ephesus its pride—magnificent and fickle Ephesus. The cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," would often be recalled in his musings; and a fear of a return to idolatry, as well as a sense of the heresies and errors he had foreseen, must have awakened his anxiety to guard against them, and shelter and sustain the converts by the ministrations of one, whom he places nearly upon an equality with himself.

Here then was a meet opportunity to meditate, to methodize, to embody in a permanent record the precepts and lessons, before delivered orally, to enlarge them, to increase the authority before bestowed, to secure the polity of the Christian Church for the time, and consummate it for all the future. Those precepts and lessons to Timothy were not for him, or the Church at Ephesus or in Asia, alone, but were to endure in their sacred truth, for all ages, for every Church, in every land.

Many objections to this hypothesis are found in the arguments used in defence or contradiction of the position, that this, with the other Pastoral Epistles, was written during the interval period.

* *Acts xxiv. xxv. xxvi.*

† *Ellicott* p. 64.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ See a striking description of the city in *Calmet, in verbo.*

Thus, St. Paul tells the Elders of Ephesus at Miletus, that "they should see his face no more," and they left him "sorrowing most of all for the words he had spoken, that they should see his face **no more.**"* Yet in the First Epistle to Timothy he says, "I **write** unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mightest know how to conduct thyself in the house of God." "Till I come, attend to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine."†

It is said Timothy had been requested to abide at Ephesus; the Epistle was addressed to him at Ephesus; and St. Paul expected to go to him there. There is then, it has been urged, a contradiction between the predictions in Acts, and the expectation in the Epistle, only reconcilable on the theory, that the Epistle was written before the farewell.

Dr. Mc Knight and Bishop Henry Onderdonk supporters of the interval date, reply: No question of faith or practice was involved.

The Apostle spoke from strong fears of the result. What the Holy Ghost did witness (*communicate*) to him, was only that bonds and afflictions awaited him. The rest was the earnest expression of affectionate apprehension as to the future.

Dr. McKnight states another argument thus. "But it may be asked, what occasion was there, in an Epistle written after the Apostle's release, to give Timothy directions concerning the ordination of Bishops and Deacons in a Church, where there were so many Elders already?"

He answers, "that the number in the year 58 might be too few in 65. That false teachers had entered, to oppose whom new ministers were necessary to replace the losses by death."

This reply of Dr. McKnight has of course greater weight upon his theory than upon the one now suggested. There would be upon the former six or seven years between the meeting at Miletus and the writing of the Epistles; upon the latter, not over two years.

But another answer seems decisive. The power to ordain Ministers was to be a permanent power, looking to a succession in the Church. The authority to regulate and to discipline was also to be continuous. Even if restricted to Ephesus, these were lasting powers, stretching over the future. But they were not limited to Ephesus. There is a marked agreement among the learned, that the office and authority of Timothy extended over the Province

* Acts xx. 25-35.

† 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; iv. 13.

afterwards known in the Church, as Asia Proper, or Proconsularis. There is reason to suppose, it was even more extensive.

It is again said, that the heresies condemned in First Timothy could not have grown up, without the lapse of many years, and forbid the idea of an early date. Our hypothesis allows of the lapse of nearly or quite two years from the meeting at Miletus to the Epistle. The time of the appeal to Caesar may plausibly be conjectured.

This position is one taken by those writers who deny the Pauline character of the Epistles. It depends upon establishing, that the nature of those heresies was plainly such as were developed at a later period, say in the Second century; that no trace of them is found in books allowed to be genuine; and that the improbability of their existence in the Apostolic age is clear.

Wiesinger in an elaborate argument examines these propositions. He comes to the conclusion, that all that are indicated in the Epistles existed in the Apostolic period; although he places the Epistles at a very late date of that period. He is an advocate of the interval theory.

The turning point on this branch of the subject is, in Bauer's language, "that the heretics of the epistle are the Gnostics of the second century." Now Wiesinger argues, that if this be true, what is said of the heretics must fully correspond with the Gnostics of that century. "Though allusions in the Epistles might correspond with particular features in the Gnosis, that would not be enough to show that they belonged to the second century." Very strongly is it observed by him, that Bauer himself has admitted that elements of the Gnostic system were in existence before the time of Christ, viz. Judaism. It is they who deny that these Epistles were written by St. Paul, who press the view now considered; but one of them is driven to admit, that the historical notices preclude their being placed later than the end of the first century.

We submit, that if four to five years were sufficient for the development of such phases of heresies as the Epistle exhibits, about two years cannot be deemed unreasonably short. The dwellers in these lands were precocious in their intellects as well as in their vices. Grecian or Oriental genius required but little time to give birth to new theories and fanciful and false doctrines. A short period would suffice to mature the errors and heresies disclosed in

the third and fourth verses of the Epistle into all the corruptions subsequently noticed, and to sow the seeds of all that was predicted for the future. The Apostle at Miletus had prophesied the entering of grievous wolves, teachers of false destructive doctrine among them. A tenet of Gnosticism, the resurrection of the awakened soul from the death of ignorance to the life of knowledge, would ripen soon in minds which were proud of a separation from the vulgarity of pagan faith. One extreme development of this heresy, the denial of the death in the body and resurrection of Jesus Christ, existed among the Corinthians, and is the subject of the great fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to them. St. Jerome says, "that the body of Christ was declared to be a phantom while the Apostles were yet in the world, and the blood of Christ was still fresh in Judea." (*Apud. Wadd. Hist. of the Church*, p. 70).

But the writers who have vindicated the Pauline authorship, do essentially vindicate our theory of an earlier date for this Epistle to Timothy than they assign, because they cannot but fail in showing, that the corruption of faith disclosed, could not have been the fruits of about two years as well as of five.

It is again urged that the development of the Church polity and organization in the Pastoral Epistles; the detailed rules for the choice and ordering of the Bishops and Deacons in First Timothy; a system so matured, was inappropriate to the Church until a much later date; did not belong to it; and is nowhere disclosed but in these Epistles.

This view is mainly urged by those who deny the authenticity of the Epistles; and the argument is really this. The hierarchical principle, as it is termed, is found developed in the second century. The Epistles contain that principle. It is not found in any other part of the New Testament allowed to be genuine. Hence these Epistles could not have been written in the Apostolic age.

We understand that Bauer is considered as one of the ablest of the impugners of the authenticity. His arguments are elaborately stated by Wiesinger, and the answers of the latter and other writers seem very satisfactory.*

The argument of Bauer contains the propositions above stated, and is curious. He insists that the hierarchical system, (Episcopal

* *Clark's Foreign Th. Lib.* xlii. 58.

superiority) had no existence until the second century. But the Epistles contain the plainest declarations and assertions of such a system, prescribe rules, under the professed sanction of Apostolic power, for its exercise; and provide for its continuance. In short hierarchy is as clearly developed in them, as by Ignatius in the second century.

As a branch of the same argument Bauer refers to the extreme care evinced in the Epistles as to ecclesiastical government, and the regulation of ministry and members of every class.

Next he contends that there is not a word in all the other New Testament writings, which sustains such a system, but much which contradicts it. And while admitting that we must associate a certain oversight and superintendence with the first rise of a Christian Congregation, he holds that "the oldest among the first converts became Presidents of the Congregations," as they were formed.

And somewhat singularly he regards this early constitution of the Church as strictly monarchical. An absolute power of government was vested in these Bishops or Presbyters, those terms being applied to the same class of persons. The democratic theory, as it is termed by other German authors, is discarded by him.

Another writer, De Wette, adopts the same theory, but makes the development of Episcopacy to have taken place at the end of the first century, an unfortunate admission for his argument, as Wiesinger observes, (on *Philippians* 75. *For. Th. Lib.* xxiii. p. 168).

Wiesinger's line of reasoning in opposition to Bauer, is, that a presbyter did not, by virtue of age, and being "a first fruit," become the head of a congregation, and thus represent a monarchical principle; but although regard was had to these circumstances, he was chosen or ordained by Apostles, probably with the consent of the people. The system was not that of a single presbyter to a single congregation; but several congregations formed one body, and the presbyters collectively ruled over them; and this lasted until the Episcopal element prevailed.

But what is the system of polity presented in the Epistles? It is plain, and allowed by the mass of writers, that Elders, Presbyters or Bishops, were ordained by the Apostles for churches, as they planted them. And let it be conceded now, that these

terms for a considerable time, indicated the same office. Deacons are addressed as a class in the Epistle to the Philippians. Wiesinger insists that there is little reason to doubt the existence of such office-bearers in the Apostolic times. Without referring to the offices of Teachers, Pastors, etc., we have in these two classes, ministerial functions plainly vested.

And what more does the Epistle show as to further ministerial rule? It shows the delegation of Apostolic authority to Timothy to ordain Elders, to rule Elders, and the Church at large; such a control and supervision as the Apostle himself could exercise. It cannot be better stated than in the language of Calvin, as to the Epistle to Titus. "Paul wrote with the design of arming Titus with his own authority for sustaining so great a load. For it cannot be doubted that he ran the risk of being set at naught by some, as if he was of no special account among the pastors. Hence we may infer that Paul did not so much write privately to Titus, as publicly to the Cretans. . . . Since due honor might not be shown to him, Paul invests him with his own authority, both in ordaining ministers, and in the entire direction of the Church." (*Introduction to the Epistle*, quoted by Lange, *Epistle to Titus*, p. 2, ed. 1869.)

We are not dealing with the question of the high importance of this part of the apostolic polity upon the question of transmitted Episcopacy; only with the point of the alleged incompatibility of such a feature in that polity at the early period we assign for this Epistle to Timothy. It is obvious that the time when such a system would be adopted, if it originated with an Apostle at all, would be governed, *first*, by the growth of the church, and next by the inability of the Apostle to meet its needs, by personal supervision. Before the imprisonment at Cæsarea, St. Paul had established a great number of churches in Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, and Crete. One accusation against him was, that not only at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, he had turned away many people. Such an enlargement of the church in those regions, as it diminished the power of the Apostle to supervise it, called for and produced the appointment of another in his place, endued with part of his essential power.

Add to these considerations the fact, that St. Paul anticipated a long absence, to state the case no stronger, and we have every

motive combining for deputing Timothy to govern in his stead, at this very period.

Among the arguments which the advocates of the late date of the Epistles, as well as those who question their authenticity, use, are the injunctions as to widows in the fifth chapter of 1st Timothy. It is urged that here was a development of a church institution, which could not have taken place at so early a period of her history.

An examination of all the passages upon the subject, shows—

That there were widows in the church, indigent, religious, and with none to provide for them; that the church assumed the duty of succoring them; that a list was to be kept, and none admitted to regular support under the age of sixty years. Certain qualifications were to be possessed to make them “widows indeed,” whom alone the church was to relieve.

So early as the appointment of Deacons, we find widows the object of solicitude and charity; and when Dorcas was restored to life, the Apostles called the saints and widows, and presented her alive.*

The advanced age required may have been on the assumption, that those within it, might be able to support themselves. The condemnation of idleness by the Apostle is frequent and marked.

There is not the semblance of difficulty in any passage, except in verses 11, 12, and 13.

Young widows were to be refused, because they would wax wanton against Christ, marry, and cast off their first faith; besides, they would grow idle, wander from house to house, etc.

These widows† in the 14th and 15th verses, he enjoins to marry, to rule the house, etc. Then is the direction to all believers connected with widows to relieve them, that the church be not charged, that it may relieve those that are widows indeed.

Again, young widows were to be refused, because if they did not marry, they would be idle and tattlers. The widow indeed, one to be relieved, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day.

* Acts ix. 41.

† The learned, I believe, agree that the widows, and not women, are meant in the 14th verse.

In all this there is not a word indicating a vow of any kind; not a word implying a *quasi* ministerial character; not a syllable as to an instituted body, a *Collegium Viduarum*, as it is termed, nor an order of Deaconesses. A class is defined for which the church is to provide. Who shall receive its aid are pointed out, the qualifications stated, and also who shall be refused.

The opinion of Dr. Davidson, that the Order of Deaconesses was in existence and referred to,* is very fully examined, and we think refuted, by Wiesinger,† who however, considers that such widows occupied a station of distinction and honor in the church. He admits that there is no other passage in the New Testament which proves the existence of such an institution of widows, or even of its beginning in the Apostolic era. It may, however, be deduced from pages in ancient writers, chiefly Tertullian and Clemens of Alexandria, that such an institution existed at the end of the second century. That it was traced back to the Apostolical directions in this Epistle to justify it, would be very natural, even if wholly indefensible.

That the church allowed such a body, regulated it, appointed a form of ordering them, possibly with imposition of hands, is to be granted. (*Bingham*, 1, 284, 292.) The question is, what did this Epistle declare, or ordain? It is absolutely certain, that it formed no order, but only regulated the conditions upon which widows should be the objects of the general charity of the church.

Another argument is used. It is said that there is a marked resemblance of style, thought and expression in the three Epistles, so much as to lead to the conclusion that they were written about the same time; and as second Timothy was written during the last imprisonment, we must adopt that as the date of the others.

If the views we have submitted are correct, the Epistle to Titus, and the First to Timothy, were written within less than two years of each other. The argument can have little weight as to these. But Dr. Hales' reply to Paley, upon this matter, seems satisfactory. The resemblance may justly be ascribed to the identity of the situation and circumstances of Titus and Timothy. The object and aim of the Epistles were mainly the same, viz: the regulation

* *Introd.*, vol. III, pp. 36, 37.

† *Wiesinger, First Timothy; Foreign Library*, vol. 23, p. 482, et seq.

of the exercise of the powers conferred upon them, and the warning against errors of a kindred nature.

We trust this investigation has tended to throw some light upon this interesting question, and leaves the argument for the place and date of First Timothy being at Cæsarea, toward the close of St. Paul's imprisonment, the most reasonable of all theories, and free from any serious objection.

ART. VII.—THE CRITERIA OF THE FAITH.

THE word faith, as it is commonly used, has two meanings. It is used, first, to mean objective or outward faith, or those things we are to believe. It is used, secondly, to mean subjective or inward faith, or the power, faculty or disposition of soul by which we believe—by which we take hold of and realize the objects of faith. The discussion carried on in these pages relates to the objective faith; and the purpose of this discussion is to point out a clew which will conduct the mind with authoritativeness and certainty to the true objective faith.

There are two general depositories of this faith. The first are the Holy Scriptures, which, as the inspired oracles of God, are the original source of faith. The second is that visible body called the Christian Church; for the Christian Church, being built upon the faith as its foundation, must needs be a depository of that faith. But both the Scriptures and the Christian Church are depositories of the faith in a general and indefinite sense. In the Scriptures it is not set down in a scientific, technical, abstract way, but is diffused through them without method or precision; and it is this which has given occasion for founding upon the Scriptures opposite and different systems. And as regards the Christian Church, while this Church is built up upon the faith revealed, and so must be a depository of the faith, yet such is now the unhappy condition of the Church, that at first view it is impossible to say in what part of it the true faith, in its absolute integrity, is to be found. The Christian Church is grievously divided into various parts or branches; and many of these branches differ among themselves on this very point, as to what the true faith really is. All of these

branches no doubt hold a part of the true faith. In some one of these branches at least, if not in more, the faith, in its integrity, must be found ; for the promise of Christ has been given to keep the light of His full truth always shining in His Church. But in what particular part of the Church the truth or faith is to be found, does not for the reason just mentioned, at first sight appear. While, then, both the Scriptures and the Christian Church are depositories of the faith, yet the former are so written, and the latter is now in such a condition, that the first view of them does not point it out. Now, in this state of things it should be expected, that there would be a guide or clew to this faith. We find that there is such a clew; and this clew is derived from the Holy Scriptures and the Christian Church considered together.

Let us now endeavor to find out what this clew is. This clew seems the result of an argument, brief, simple, and conclusive ; and the first step in this argument is, *that the one faith delivered by Jesus Christ and His inspired Apostles was a faith which was never to change, but is precisely now what it was at the beginning, and what it will continue to be until the end of the world.* This is the position taken by at least every Protestant body. The principle animating all systems of belief (at least in the Protestant world) is, that the Scriptures reveal one, unchangeable faith ; and the claim of each particular system is, that itself is the expounder of that one, unchangeable faith. That the faith revealed in the Scriptures—whatever that faith may be—is *one*, a thing fixed and absolute, results directly from the unity of God. Scripture is by no means the comments of men upon Scripture, but the *sense* of Scripture is Scripture; and that sense is, and only can be, one, since God is one. If Scripture teaches the doctrine of the Trinity, it does not teach Unitarianism—if it teaches the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, it does not teach Universalism—if it teaches an Atonement through the Blood of Christ, it does not teach an Atonement through any other means. The truth or faith revealed in Scripture is one; and that this faith was *never to change* is shown, 1st, By the essential character of Christianity. 2d, By the express words of Scripture.

1st. It is evident from the essential character of Christianity, that the faith revealed by Christ and His inspired Apostles, was never to change. For consider; Christianity came from the hand of Christ completed and perfect, and so unchangeable in its char-

acter. Christianity was full-grown at its birth, and in this respect stands alone. In other things perfection is the result of a gradual growth from an imperfect beginning. There is, for example, the steam engine. How perfect is the present steam engine, compared with the first one made! The first steam engine was comparatively a very imperfect machine. But, from time to time, improvements were made, and the result is the steam engine we now see; and doubtless improvements will continue to go on—improvements which will put the steam engine made twenty years hence far in advance of those now in use. In regard to the things of this world, perfection is the result of a gradual growth and improvement from an imperfect beginning. But Christianity came from the hand of Christ completed and perfect; for Christianity is contained in the revelations made in the Scriptures by Christ personally, and by Him through His inspired servants—and these Scriptures are a completed and perfect revelation. After the revelation made by Christ in the Holy Scriptures, there were to be no more revelations—and in fact there have been no more revelations. As, therefore, Christianity was revealed by a Revealer who was perfect—as it was revealed for the benefit of a human nature essentially the same in all ages—and as it was revealed in a revelation which ended and was completed with the disclosures made by Christ in the Scriptures—therefore Christianity came from the hand of Christ completed and perfect. And hence the objective faith Christ revealed (which is the heart of Christianity) was revealed a completed and perfect faith. And this faith being perfect, we are thereby taught, that it cannot change, that it must be fixed, that it remains one and the same from the beginning, perfect in itself, and so incapable of being increased or diminished. And thus, from the essential character of Christianity, we learn that the faith revealed by Christ was never to change.

2d. It is evident from the express words of Scripture, that the faith revealed by Christ and His inspired servants was never to change. St. Jude in his Epistle, says: "I exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was *once delivered* to the saints." The faith, then, which men are to receive, was once delivered (so the Scriptures tell us) by Christ and His inspired servants, and having been once delivered, it is not to be delivered again, but is to continue unchanged, one and the same from the

beginning. And hear what St. Paul says to the same effect. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, writes: Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And to confirm the impression contained in these words, thereby showing their special importance, the Apostle repeats them in the next verse, saying: "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed." It is, then, St. Paul's testimony, that the Gospel, doctrine, or faith which he had taught—the very same which the other inspired servants of Christ had taught, the very same which Christ Himself had taught—was to remain one and the same, unchanged and unchangeable, so that if thereafter, he should teach any other doctrine, or even if an angel from heaven should teach any other doctrine, he or the angel would be a deceiver, and must be held accursed. Again, St. Paul tells us in his Epistle to the Ephesians, that: "There is one Lord, *one* faith, one baptism." One Lord, one faith in that Lord, one baptism in which we profess that faith. Scripture here teaches us that the faith we are to receive, is *one*. But how *one*? Not simply, as some might say, because it is the same every where at any one time, but because it is essentially the same at all times, because it is unchangeable. The necessary faith revealed is here said to be one just as our Lord is one, just as baptism is one. There are not two baptisms, but one baptism. Baptism is here said to be one, because in its nature and administration it was to be unchanged, remaining for all time one and the same. And for the like reason the faith revealed by Christ is said to be one, because it was a faith which was never to change. Again, there are not two Lords, but one Lord. Our Lord is here said to be one, because He changes not, because He is for all time our one and only Lord Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever: therefore He is one. And since the faith revealed by Christ is one, just as our Lord is one, that faith is one, because it is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever—because it was never to change.

It appears, then, both from the essential character of Christianity, and from the express words of Scripture, that the one faith Christ revealed was never to change. In certain quarters we hear of a doctrine called *development*, development of the faith. But

there can be no such thing as a development of necessary faith. It is true indeed that the *language* in which this faith is expressed, may be developed. What is called the Nicene Creed is an instance of this. The Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed, in point of doctrine exactly fit each other—they cover precisely the same ground. But in the Nicene Creed, as compared with the Apostles' Creed, we see a development of the language or scientific expression, not a development of the faith or doctrine. To repeat, the language in which the faith is expressed may be developed, and there may be a development of the practical power of this faith in the heart; but the development of the faith itself, as of something incomplete, is a delusion and a snare. The objective truth made known to us by Christ, the necessary faith revealed by Him, is, and has always been, one and the same, a faith which is essentially unchanging and unchangeable, which is not to be added to nor taken from, but which, having been once revealed a perfect faith, remains fixed and unchanged forever.

The first step in the argument was to show that the faith revealed by Christ was never to change; and this step having been taken, let us now proceed to the next step—which is, that this faith which was never to change, *has always been preserved to the Christian Church*. The Christian Church is that one Society of believers which was originated by our Lord Jesus Christ, and has been perpetuated from Him. The oneness or unity of the Church is essential and indestructible. There may be divisions, or different branches, and between these branches there may be bitter controversies and want of communion and kindly feeling; but this state of things, though involving those who have brought it about in a vast amount of shame and guilt, does not affect the essential unity of the Church, as that unity arises out of its *origin and derivation from one source, Jesus Christ*. Between the different branches of a family, there may be hatred and estrangement, but the family is never the less one, because it is derived from a common ancestor, and has one blood; and so the Christian Church has an indestructible oneness or unity, because it has been perpetuated from one source. Now, when it is said, that the true faith has always been preserved to the Christian Church, it is not meant that that faith has always been preserved in its perfect integrity, to every branch of the Church; but this is meant, that by the divine Providence, the true objective faith has never ceased, has never become extinct, in the

Christian Church. And that this is so appears, 1st, From the character and design of the Church, and 2d, From the plain teaching of Scripture.

1st. What is the design of that divine society, called the Church ? Is it not to be the keeper and witness of divine truth ? Is it not to exhibit to the world the faith Christ revealed, to hand down that faith from age to age ? Most clearly. It would be supposed, then, that, although the Church to-day, and during a considerable part of her career, stands marred, through the folly and wickedness of men, by division and estrangement, yet that being a supernatural kingdom—supernatural in its preservation, as well as in its origin—the design for which its divine Founder instituted it would never be thwarted, that is, that the true faith would never cease or become extinct in it. But

2d. That the true faith has always been preserved in the church, appears from the plain teaching of Scripture; for Scripture teaches that Christ left to the Christian Church the perpetual legacy of His Spirit for this very end. Consider these words, addressed by Christ to His Apostles, on the eve of His ascension : “ Lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” The context shows that the promise contained in these words, relates to the Christian Church. Our Lord is here speaking of the Christian Church. He had just given to the Apostles and their successors, as governors of the Church, this great commission : “ Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Then these words immediately follow : “ And lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” This promise could not have been addressed to the Apostles personally or individually, since it was a promise which was to be effectual, even unto the end of the world ; but, as the context shows, it was addressed by Christ to His Apostles and their successors in office, as governors of that spiritual kingdom, of which they were the twelve pillars, Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, as representatives of that Christian Church over which they were now, in the place of Christ, visibly to preside. Evidently, therefore, the meaning of these words—“ Lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world ”—is, that Christ was to be *perpetually present with His Church*. But how present, and for what end ? His perpetual presence with His Church could not be the presence of His Humanity ; for His Hu-

manity, when this promise was made, was on the eve of Ascension into the Heavens. Nor could this perpetual presence here promised be that general presence of God in the world which is necessary to the world's existence; for a particular, special presence, is here referred to. There can be but one other presence of Christ, and that is His presence by His Spirit. So, this perpetual presence of Christ with His Church, promised in the above words, is and can only be His presence by His Spirit, that Spirit which is called in the Scriptures "the Spirit of Truth," (John xv. 26,) because its function was to keep the Church in the knowledge of the truth or faith, that is, was to preserve the faith (which is the essential truth) from becoming extinct in the Church. What other sense can we affix to these words of Christ—"Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world?" But the Scriptures make this clearer. A short time before His death, Christ said to His disciples: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter (which is the Spirit) will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." Christ ascends to heaven, and, as a consequent of His ascension, sends to that Church, over which He had visibly presided, the Spirit, to supply His place or presence, and hence called "the Comforter." Now, in regard to this Spirit the Scriptures teach, it is affirmed, two things—1st, that it was to abide with the Church forever; 2d, that it was to preserve the Church in the knowledge of the truth, or the faith (which is the essential truth); and hence this Spirit is called "the Spirit of Truth." Let one plain text suffice here. In terms which ought not to be misunderstood, Christ says: "I will pray the Father, and He will give you (when I am gone) another Comforter (to take my place) that He may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth." If the Spirit of truth was to abide perpetually with the Christian Church, is it to be thought that that truth or faith which the Church was instituted to exhibit should ever become extinct or be lost? Were it ever to come to pass that the essential truth or faith should fail throughout the whole Church, could it be said that the Spirit of truth was with the Church? And yet the infallible promise of Christ is, that that Spirit shall abide with the Church forever. He who fairly reads the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel, is taught, that the visible presence of Christ in the Church was to be sup-

plied, after His departure, by the Spirit; and that while this Spirit was to affect the immediate Apostolic Church in an extraordinary and miraculous manner, it was still, *as the Spirit of truth*, to abide perpetually with the Christian Church; and for what other end was it to abide therein, than to keep that Church in the knowledge of the truth or faith?

Now it is clear, that this promise of Christ, thus to be by His Spirit with His Church, could not mean that every branch of the Christian Church should always be kept in the true faith. That would be directly against facts; for we know that one particular Church affirms that to be essential truth which another particular Church denies, and both cannot be right. And yet the promise of Christ to dwell forever in His Church by His Spirit, and thereby keep it from all vital error—from the belief of what is essentially false, and from the non-belief of what is essentially true—must be an effectual promise? What then is the scope of this promise? It is, that the true faith should never fail or become extinct in the Christian Church—that, though in one quarter of the Church some parts of this faith may be denied, though in another quarter this faith may, by false doctrines, be covered over and partially obscured—yet that the one, true, and full faith should never become extinct or lost in the Church, but should continue to shine therein, even unto the end of the world. The essential faith of the Christian Church is the rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. The Church is a supernatural kingdom, and her faith, which is her life, is protected by supernatural means. This faith is never to fail or become extinct, but, by the sure promise and word of Christ, will, in its complete integrity, be preserved in the Church perpetually. We conclude, therefore, from all that has now been said, 1st, That the one faith Christ revealed was never to change; 2d, That this faith was, by the promise and word of Christ, never to fail or become extinct in the Christian Church, but was to be preserved to it forever.

It follows directly from these premises, that the objective faith taught by Christ, runs back in an unbroken line to the beginning of Christianity. It further follows, that if any point along this line can be found, where the whole Christian Church agreed in the profession of the same faith, that faith must for all time be the true objective faith; for otherwise it must be concluded, either

that the true faith has failed throughout the entire Christian Church, which is against the promise and word of Christ, or that His faith has changed, which is contrary to what has been shown. Now, it is affirmed, that for the first three hundred years after Christ the faith set forth in the Nicene creed, that faith which propounds to us the great essential doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Resurrection of the Dead, the Judgment and the Everlasting Life, was the faith, and the only faith professed by the entire Christian Church. If, therefore, the above reasoning be correct, this faith must be the true objective faith revealed by Christ for all time; and this is the faith held and taught by the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country.

This creed is the foundation on which the Episcopal Church rests. It is the Church's distinguishing feature, by which the judgment men form of her should chiefly be made. We sometimes see a commotion within her pale, occasioned by such a movement as that of Ritualism, or by the extreme opinions of individuals on these points upon which a latitude of opinion is allowed. These, however, are perturbations which may cause the Church momentarily to vibrate in her course, but cannot control that course. The essential feature of a Church, that which gives it a permanent character, is its creed or faith; and the faith of the Episcopal Church, it is repeated, is that historic creed which has just been spoken of; a faith which is commended to us by the two essential qualities of stability and truth. We are to note that this creed, while it is the creed of the Episcopal Church, is not a creed which the Episcopal Church originated, but which she, as a branch of the church Catholic, is, in her sphere, simply *the means of transmitting*. As she did not make the creed, she cannot change a syllable of it. She *receives* this creed. This creed has come down to the Episcopal Church of to-day, as the ancient, historic, Apostolic faith, which she must accept, and pass on to posterity—which she can neither add to nor take from, which she has no power in any way to alter. The creed is an immovable, unchanging body of divine truths, fairly raised beyond the sphere of speculation and doubt. Outside of these doctrines set forth in the creed, there is, in Scripture, a wide and magnificent domain, where the mind may expatiate, where private interpretation may be lawful, where

a reverent speculation is allowable. But the foregoing considerations instruct us, that the doctrines of the creed are taught with an authority and certainty which must lift these doctrines out of the regions of doubt and debate, and make them no longer fit subjects of controversy; a rock-like, immutable faith, upon whose truth and stability the soul of man may rest and be satisfied.

Let one more word be said. If the essential recommendations of a faith must be, at all times and in all places, its truth and stability, how strongly is a faith, so recommended, commended to the American people! America is emphatically the land of many beliefs. A wild license in the private interpretation of Scripture, has borne its proper fruit. It has left nothing settled. It has kept the most sublime and vital doctrines in the region of doubt and debate. It has multiplied, almost without number, systems and sects, whose religion is but a sentiment, often warm, impassioned, beautiful, yet still but a sentiment, lacking that fixedness and strength which grow up from the basis of an assured historic faith. In this confused state of things earnest men are often bewildered, and know not where to turn to find the truth.

It is from this numerous class of men that the Roman Church hopes chiefly to win recruits by presenting her firmly knit and powerful system. While the faith of the Roman Church, through her doctrine of development, is liable to perpetual change, and from time to time has actually changed, and has so piled up upon the ancient faith a mass of error, yet in her changeableness there is a certain stability. In her asserted doctrine of infallibility she has an alchymy by which these additions to the faith, as soon as they are made, are turned, as it were, into stone; and it is this fixedness in her system that forms the most alluring aspect in which she presents herself in a country like this, upon whose troubled waters are found floating so many loosely constructed and unsatisfactory phases of belief.

While these systems have (many of them) a large amount of truth, but lack stability, and while the faith of the Roman Church, on the other hand, has stability, but is chargeable with a large amount of error, it is affirmed, upon the authority of the foregoing considerations, that the Episcopal Church in this country, together with that Anglican Communion of which she forms a part, joins the fullness of truth with the fullness of stability. Her position

is the "via media," a position which loses none of its reality and importance from the frequency with which attention is directed to it. As virtue is the middle part between two vices, so truth is the middle part between two errors. The Episcopal Church in this country, in the truth and stability of her ancient historic Creed, is indeed, and it is her glory to fill this position, the "via media" between Romanism on the one hand, and Sectarianism on the other.

ART. VIII.—CLERICAL ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES.

Reports of the Annual Meetings of the Society for the Increase of the Ministry for 1868-9. Hartford.

ACCORDING to its Constitution, the Society above named seeks to attain its object in two ways. It professes "to find suitable young men for the Ministry"—which is the direct method; and "to aid them in acquiring a thorough clerical education"—which tends indirectly to the same result by removing an obstacle that, otherwise, some "suitable" persons could not surmount.

It happens, however, that practically the indirect mode of attaining the end in view, becomes much the more prominent. Little is said of the steps taken to "find" young men, while the Reports and Addresses spread before us in full the labors and successes of the society in supporting and educating its beneficiaries. We say this, not as pointing out a fault, only a fact, for which, moreover, we can see no explanation. It may be that the society says less of what it does in looking up young men and inclining their minds towards the ministry, because such labor involves personal details unmeet and indeed impossible to be told. It may be, also, that this kind of work belongs rather to the sphere of the parish, and to those who have the immediate care of souls. We take the fact in question, however, chiefly as a token that indirect influences are at work to oppose the preference of young men for the ministry, numerous and powerful enough to account for the scantiness of our clerical ranks, even though no mention be made of the direct attractions of the world. The lack of means to prosecute one's studies is, certainly, to be considered as no more than one of those indi-

rect hindrances to the choice of the clerical profession. It can rarely be insuperable to a determined spirit. With heart and conscience responding to the inward call, his would indeed be a feeble will and unenergetic temper, who could not find or make a way to support himself, while preparing for a work to which he felt himself already virtually consecrated. But there is an earlier stage in his progress, when his mind is under the sway of much feebler influences; when his inclinations are first tending to the religious life, his resolves not yet fixed. The suggestions of an over-prudent friend, or of some worldly companion, or of his own inward doubts and fears, will then be not unlikely to exercise a determining power. Among other secular considerations, the question of support will, at such a time, appear very serious. Nor is it any impeachment of the sincerity of his devotion, that he shrinks from the many restrictions upon his natural liberty which the ministry imposes, and of which straightened circumstances furnish but a single class. Though these obstacles bear no comparison with the great principles and motives on which his choice should depend, yet they are not to be slighted, nor the impression they make on his mind to be regarded as a sign of mere weakness. Whatever helps to clear them from his path does him invaluable service, even, perhaps, to the extent of determining whether or not he is to be a minister of CHRIST.

Regarding the matter in this light, we are presented with many more obstructions to an entrance into the ministry than that with which this Society specially deals. They are of the same general kind, but more subtle in their influence, and therefore not capable of such direct and effective handling. No one of them does the whole work with any one person. They act in combination. Each contributes something to the result, in various proportions, according to the character and circumstances of those who come under their influence. The general effect is always the same: to render the ministry unattractive; to hinder the youthful mind, even when religiously trained, from turning that way; to check the rising enthusiasm which not seldom is excited by the first idea of the lofty occupations and motives of the ministry; to satisfy the spirit that has begun to entertain the idea seriously, with very inadequate reasons for putting it aside. It would be scarcely possible to enumerate all the causes that hinder young men from

becoming candidates for Holy Orders. No just estimate can be formed of the numbers between whom and the ministry this world plainly and openly interposes itself, compared with those who decline the sacred service from motives not distinctly irreligious. Whether or not this class be the more numerous, it excites at least a peculiar interest. One cannot but regard it with somewhat of that feeling which the LORD Himself indicated towards the young man, who only lacked one thing to complete the act of self-surrender. CHRIST's call to follow Him reaches many minds that show at first a readiness to comply; they hesitate, and finally draw back from motives not so direct and simple as the love of great possessions, but nevertheless capable of being resolved into similar worship. They come so near using a great opportunity that their loss of it creates a keener regret.

The tenor of these remarks, however, may mislead our readers into expecting a more serious treatment of the subject than we propose. We propose, indeed, nothing like a treatment of the subject itself, but only to touch on one or two points that are wholly subordinate. Looking over two or three of the late Reports of the Society named at the head of our article, we were struck by the fact already noted, how much of effort was called forth to remove what, after all, cannot be regarded as more than one of the minor obstacles, to the increase of the ministry? How many more of these outward influences, indirect but powerful, were at work, was our next thought; and so we were led to a train of ideas which, though not of primary importance, seemed well worth presenting to the minds of those who are interested in this subject; happily, a numerous class, if the long list of patrons and subscribers in the Reports before us may be taken in evidence.

Let us say again, that we are not about to regard the subject in its most serious aspect, but to speak of some minor impediments to its fair consideration by those to whom that idea is suggested of entering the ministry.

The class of difficulties to which we refer, is connected with the estimate in which the ministry is held by churchmen generally, and the world at large.

There is no point in regard to which a young man is more sensitive than the position which he is to occupy in society on his first entrance into life. His feelings on the subject are manifested, not

so much in respect to the relative importance or dignity of his future occupation, whatever it may be, as to the personal consideration he shall have from those who meet him. The precocity of Young America is so remarkable, not to say appalling, that one who counts his half century can perhaps hardly venture to draw upon his own youthful experience in illustration of the ways of thinking that accompany adolescence in these later years. Nature does not radically change, however; and life has still its spring time when the buds open modestly, and the rising shoot is tender, and the tints are delicate. We are persuaded that the boys around us do not all get to be men without passing through some such season, however shortened it may be by the change that seems to have taken place in our moral climate. It is at that period that the boy thinks most of becoming a man; makes much of the daily increasing tokens that his manhood is dawning on the eyes of others; flutters in spirit when some call is made upon him to sustain his natural dignity; fancies himself in all imaginable positions that manhood can occupy; notes with keenest observation whatever in them is gratifying or offensive to personal feeling, and takes his cue how to esteem place and professions from the signs, none is quicker to interpret than he, of the estimate the grown-up world puts upon such things. From fifteen to twenty years of age youth is most impressionable under such influences. And in what light is the ministry too often set, at this sensitive period, before eyes that are so jealously observant of everything that lessens the sense of personal importance? Not in its own intrinsic worth, nor as it is presented on a deliberate survey of its advantages and drawbacks as compared with other modes of life, but under impressions for the most part produced by the prevalent tone of society—flippant towards all sacred things, and, if not contemptuous, yet showing an utter skepticism as to the reality and force of motives that profess to be controlled by higher and holier things than worldly gain, temporal ease, and physical comfort. We need not instance, for our present purpose, the grossly offensive forms in which this criticism upon the professed aims and motives of the ministry expresses itself. But do not our young men come in contact every day with a more effective, because not so bitter and prejudiced, disparagement of the ministry? Are they not habit-

uated to comments of this sort among persons not disposed to speak lightly of religion or its ministers?

The topic, we will suppose, is the relative standing of the ministry as a profession among the many others that invite a choice.

A very respectable profession, indeed—is the courteously expressed opinion—but hardly to be chosen by a young man of spirit and energy. He will put himself at a great disadvantage by so doing. There is not the harmony between the Ministry and the Age, there once was. It has fallen behind, so far as it keeps its old character; or rather, it has eddied off on one side of the great current of life. Some men make their mark in it, as they would under any circumstances. There are those who confound making a sensation with making a mark. But for the rest, it looks like a harbor where a large number of craft that dare not spread sail to the outside gales, rock peacefully on the gentle undulations of the parish and the parsonage. It is a profession in the main of small incomes, very often miserably inadequate and irregularly paid; but taking into account the average of moderate livings, earned without that downright hard labor that other occupations require. If it is little, it comes easily. The clergy are, to a considerable extent, men of literary leisure, by whom many an hour that is a working hour for other men, is spent in the stillness and repose of the study, made attractive according to their taste, and welcome as a place of shelter from out-door annoyances. They set their own hours. They arrange their work, to a great extent, as suits their own convenience, and manage sometimes to give it the go-by when not agreeable, no one being the wiser. Not questioning their usefulness as members of society, it may be allowed that they do not seem so necessary to its very existence as some other classes. Trade, art, science, are the very pillars and buttresses of society, manifestly upholding the whole structure. The ministry answers rather to its slighter parts that cannot well be dispensed with, indeed, but do not palpably impress us with the idea of their essential importance.

The above paragraph fairly indicates, we believe, the habitual tone of what is called “society,” when expressing itself on this subject. The sum of its criticism is, not that the clergy are idlers, but that they are, as a class, her *Forcible-Feeble* of society. They are busy enough, but in a weaker way than other men; less ener-

getic, less telling. Of course, such an estimate of ministerial labor is founded, either in skepticism as to there being any value in spiritual offices, or, at least, without due consideration of the real effect produced even on the temporal course of affairs by such an order of men. Whatever the account to be made of it, it is not the mere unworthy expression of a baseless prejudice. It indicates how the matter really looks to those who only glance at its surface. There is an apparent exemption from the necessity of incessant toil, that constitutes a marked distinction of clerical life. The clergy seem indeed free from that stern compulsion under which the merchant, the lawyer, or the artisan, have to put forth their utmost and uninterrupted exertions to carry on the grand business of life. How far this appearance is a reality, and whether it justifies a lower estimate of the worth and dignity of the clerical profession, are points that deserve to be seriously considered.

We care not, then, to deny that this apparent exemption from that sort of pressure under which secular business is ordinarily conducted, is a reality; rather, we claim it as a privilege of the clerical life. It is one of the compensations, and no slight one, for many temporal drawbacks to which that life is subject. As such, it may properly be pressed upon the attention of young persons as an advantage to be enjoyed with a clear conscience and full self-respect, even though other men make it the occasion of disparagement, both personal and official. How much such disparagement is worth may be understood when we consider what the indications are of that comparative ease which invites such criticism.

To begin with the simplest: how suggestive is the mere contrast between the scenes in which business men and clergymen spend their days—the office, the counting-room, the shop, and home! To the business mind home is the synonym for ease. To be at home, and to work, are contradictories. To which the preference is given depends much upon habits and temper. The spirit of our people seems to find a pleasure in the scenes of business, far above any that home can afford. Still, we have not lost all our sympathy in the sentiment of the greatest of songs—“There’s no place like home.” Many a man is loath to leave it, even for a day. Many a house-father as he shuts his door behind him, sighs at the contrast of the scenes through which he must pass till he

returns again at eve. And that return—how welcome after a day of toil! What relief to the over-worked spirit! What a mighty Fortress that soft domestic circle is against the host of outside cares! Perhaps a mind genial enough to feel all this, would not be sharp to note and criticise the happier fortune of one whose field of daily occupation has its centre at home. Nevertheless the fact stands, and it seems to indicate an easier life, less energetic, less productive of results, than that which engages in the struggle of the forum and the market. The general look of things, not the close consideration of details, affects popular opinion. The broad difference speaks for itself. Other men go off to their work to a place for work only; the clergyman stays at home amid its softening associations and its frequent opportunities for a self-indulgent spirit; and can it be that his is not a life of ease compared with their's?

To judge fairly, one must take average cases. The pastor of a large city parish occupies his domestic fortress under a state of daily siege. "Died of a door-bell," was the epitaph one of them suggested for himself. There are rural parsonages, on the other hand, whose heart-music is sounded by "muffled" drums, indeed; or its key-note is given by the drone of a bee on a still summer day. But in all ordinary cases, the sphere of the clergyman's work, though its centre be at home, demands as much as any form of labor those qualities of activity, industry, method, promptness and perseverance which constitute an energetic life in whatever mode or place developed. We speak not now of the sense of duty and of spiritual responsibility, the pressure of which when duly felt, no form of secular exigency can exceed. Taking merely the outward routine of work—the elements of which are study and composition, visiting, parochial business and public ministrations—it requires, in order to be run off smoothly and successfully, a sort of attention and amount of exertion utterly inconsistent with any idea of leisure, wholly incompatible with ease. That this is really so needs no citation of instances; it is within the observation of any man. If it be duly considered, we feel no concern lest any ground be left in his home-life to disparage the energy and efficiency of the clergyman. We have no hesitation in admitting that to be much at home, in his own quiet study and amid his family circle, is a privilege he enjoys above other men. He has a right

to it. It comes to him in the natural order of things—capable, as any other advantage or benefit is, of being misused ; but, in that proportion in which it is providentially mingled with his daily lot, a healthful relief to labor, a temporal alleviation of the penalty of toil granted him in return for his willing consecration of his whole time and strength to his Maker and Redeemer. Let other men allow him its use ungrudgingly. Let him ever maintain his privilege in this respect unabridged by false shame, or unmanly fear of unjust or unkindly criticism.

The sailor in the ballad, thought that “the gentlemen of England” lived “at home at ease,” for he had no notion of toil in any other shape than his experience furnished. The compulsion of the winds and waves was too direct and peremptory to permit the idea of any milder constraint. So it would seem that men in secular life think that no real necessity can be imposed, except it be by that most imperative of Task-masters, “Business,” who, if his servants break his rules or neglect his work, mulcts them ruthlessly in financial loss or ruin. Grant that the clergyman has real and important work to do, who *makes* him do it ? We business men have to accomplish our task in set hours ; there is no “let up” to the obligation ; there is small chance of postponement or substitution of one sort of work for another. The hod-carrier with his pile of bricks and ladder before him, hardly has his work for ten hours more sharply marked out than we have, if we have energy enough to push business, or if our business has life enough in it to push us. Now compare with this the clerical day. No doubt some things must be done therein when the particular time for them comes, but how large the liberty of apportioning time to work, of selecting the work to come first, of postponing what is unpleasant, and slighting what is disagreeable ! These are indulgences that blunt the very edge of toil. This is liberty which it is not in man to neglect ; he will use it to the full. And if he does so use it, is he to be called a worker by the side of the almost slave to business, such as nine men out of ten are, if they would keep their head financially above water—much more, if they aim to ride the topmost wave ?

Well—there is some truth in this, but, as in the previous instance, no more than may be claimed as a reasonable privilege, when we take into account some things which these writers leave

out. We have already hinted at one assumption on their part that can by no means be admitted, viz., that there is no sufficient constraint to work where there is no immediate penalty. We doubt if the annals of the exchange could produce an instance wherein the necessities of trade drove a man to greater exertions, than did that "necessity" which was laid on St. Paul to preach the Gospel. Is this a case of exceptional enthusiasm? The same constraint, proceeding from the same principles, acting in the same way, is felt in some real measure by every man who has sincerely taken the vows of the ministry. It regulates his work as strictly as though he were laboring under the eyes of an overseer. It holds him to an account which he cannot escape, except by such obtuseness of conscience as cannot exist where there is ordinary fidelity to ministerial obligation. It is not commonly thought, we trust, that any considerable number of the ministry go through any one day, much less a succession of days, without consciously confronting their ordination vows, if not directly, yet as their work itself reminds them of its sacred character. If this occur even in slight measure, it will prove no slight interference with that freedom to dispose of their work and their time at their convenience, of which the Clergy are sometimes supposed to make full use.

In the case of the majority of those who have that care of souls, we believe that it renders duty the controlling principle of the whole day. Such an assertion made of sinful and weak men however high and sacred their vocation, must be taken with many allowances. Take them all, and the result will show, as we verily believe, on the part of the ministry at large, a conscientiousness in doing the day's work, in its natural order, without evasion or neglect, that will bear comparison with the labor of any class of men in the community. For the most part, men of secular business perform their work in private. The Parish Priest has an attraction for "neighboring eyes" beyond that of beauty, so that if he falls short it cannot fail of observation. There is a little world of people that know when the Parson takes a drive, or gossips on the corner, or reads a novel, or dawdles round his house, or comes down late to breakfast, or fails to be when and where he should be and makes lame excuses for it. Granted that there may be, in certain cases, too much of this; that there may be a slighting of duty that eludes even suspicion; it scarcely lessens the

force of the truth, of which there are abundant tokens, that the sense of ministerial obligation is constant and powerful enough to *make* men work, even though they seem left to themselves in those incidents of labor, that are fixed for other men in the very forms of the business they engage in.

Deeming that we have thus disposed of what is unfair in the criticism, on the comparative liberty in work which clergymen enjoy, we accept the remainder, as simply indicating one of those compensations which are providentially granted to the ministry for many temporal disadvantages. If any one of our readers is of the class to whom the opening of the Article referred, we beg him to consider well this token of the large and generous spirit in which the Great Master deals with them when He invites them into His service. He is no task-master. He brings them into no such Egyptian bondage as characterizes most departments of secular business. Even in giving them work enough for all their faculties of soul and body, He treats them as His freemen, not His drudges. They shall arrange for themselves the forms and methods of their work, distributing it through successive days and portioning out their time according to their unfettered judgment —unfettered save by the one grand principle of subjecting every thought to CHRIST. In such a service there may be no wealth to gain; not much of social distinction; little that gratifies our earthly taste: but does any other service exist so generous in its spirit, or that so recognizes and calls out the higher qualities of our nature? He whose feet may stand on this height must needs take many downward steps to reach the level of secular business.

Fine words, indeed! but, beside what the proverb tells us fine words won't do, they will hardly be effective enough to dissipate the notion that, after all, the Clergyman's life is comparatively easy—there are so many points in its favor. It is a home life. It is unconstrained by rule, and forms of business. And, what seems more indicative still of its character, it is a life in which the holiday element largely enters. What with summer vacations, and attendance on society and other gatherings, and trips to the consecration of Bishops and Churches, and going to town or out of town "for a day or two," Parsons, like blackbirds, are frequent on the wing, and fly over time and space enough within the year to

suffice for a decade of journeyings,—say, for the whole Board of Brokers.

In reply to all this we ask but a single question. Is the Clergyman to have no Sabbath?

It seems to be a very common opinion that there is no such day for him. As to the reality of his Sunday there can be no question; if his work is ever ardent, it is then. The day of rest for other people is for him a day of toil. But when their labor begins again, is it not usually expected that his will simply continue, with a change of form but without any real intermission?

Such we believe to be the experience of every man who has the care of souls—at least in the larger parishes whether of town or country. Not only does every day bring with it ample work—as he *knows*, though some persons undervalue it—but ample proof that his people expect him to be working. It is true that there is a sort of charm on his part of a right to feel “Mondayish” which to a certain extent is admitted. But the assertion of this claim resolves itself generally into something very different from taking rest. Now and then, of a Monday morning, he will betake himself to some place where “*parsons* most do congregate” for an hour or two of clerical gossip. Or, if he live in the country, he will make his occasional trip to town, and rub rusticity off by contact with the great world. Usually, however, the second day of the week is that when the clergyman picks up and sorts away the odds and ends of duty that admitted of being postponed till he was at leisure. It is often his busiest time, on which he counts to enable him to dispose of the many small matters that stick to and prick his conscience like burrs, till they get what attention they require. So that Monday is no real Sabbath to the Clergyman.

Now it should be considered that rest from toil is as much a part of the Sabbatical idea as is religious worship. The argument that tells most with the world at large in favor of reclaiming from labor one day in seven is that such abstinence is suited to our nature: we need it for refreshment; we are made stronger by it; we do more in the six days, in the long run, than we should in the continuous efforts of the seven.

Does this rule hold good only in regard to laymen? Is the grace of orders so angelic that the man who receives it is taken out of the ordinary conditions of humanity, and made superior to

weariness, indifferent to relaxation, the more refreshed in proportion as his strength is kept in active exercise?

No such mediævalism is admitted by this practical age. Holy orders confer no such character—if they confer anything special at all. Clergymen are but ordinary men, as this age is careful to remind them, being itself unhappily reminded of that fact by too many significant tokens.

Well then—if in no respect exempt from the weaknesses of humanity, why should clergymen not enjoy their Sabbath? Why should not one day in seven of rest from labor be assigned to them as much as to their fellow mortals?

Our readers will perhaps wonder at our asking this question, as it was answered by the established usage of the day! The clerical Sabbath is a distinct and publicly recognized institution. It is not, indeed, of weekly occurrence, but it comes round once a year. It goes by another name, but it is the same thing. The summer vacation is the Clergyman's Sabbath, and a fine time he has of it! He draws his salary, and does no work. He goes off to the Land's End, if he pleases. He suits his taste in his pleasure, and takes it without stint. Rod in hand, he traces up the brook under the gentle stimulant of the Angler's craft. Gun on shoulder, he strides the ground over in the keener excitement of the hunt.

He seeks a solitude or society, as his fancy leads him to the quiet farm-house, or the fashionable hotel. One month of this life is freely accorded him; six weeks of it are not uncommon; even two whole months are not denied. Who shall say that he does not get rest enough? Whose share of this kind of enjoyment is greater than his?

Let us see if this be a fair statement of the case.

First, so far as it applies only to the Rectors of the larger city parishes. But whether one's parish be large or small, his right to one-seventh of his time is not affected.

Moreover, this summer vacation is not altogether ungrudged, even for those who can enjoy it. When extended beyond a month it occasions no small grumbling among the Laity who stay at home. Should there be no grumbling, there is a style of remark not pleasant to hear. These Parsons take life easy, says one. We bank clerks would like to change places with you, says another.

It is well enough for gentlemen of your cloth to take a long vacation, but we men of business are glad if we can get away for a few days only; and so on through a variety of 'odoriferous' comparisons.

But stop! you who are disposed to be so critical; let us treat this matter in a business way, and square accounts between Clergy and Laity in regard to their respective periods of rest and relaxation.

To begin: we set down to the lay side of the account fifty-two days in every year that are clear holidays, so much is theirs, not by special agreement or by favor of their fellow-man, but by Divine Right God gives it to them, and makes Himself answerable for all results that follow the use of His gift. He takes the burden of secular care from their shoulders. For that number of days, not only *may* they—it is their duty to put aside the anxieties of business, and the pressure of affairs that is so recurrent throughout the week, and so wearying. The call to religious worship and the restraint upon mere secular occupation and amusement, may be so regarded as not to interfere with, but rather to aid repose of mind; to promote real and pure enjoyment—the more intense by the force of contrast. It is their own fault if Sunday be not, to the Laity, of this high character. It is unquestionably their fault if it be not at least a day of rest from physical and mental toil. Add, then to the number of days thus marked out others that are legally and by custom exempted, and there are more than two months in every year of clear holiday to a very large class of persons. Every community, indeed, must have its hewers of wood and drawers of water who are stinted of their fair share of rest; and there are some spirits that have such a facility of making slaves of themselves, that they virtually do nothing but hew wood and draw water, let their occupation be what it may. For our present purpose, however, the fact is firm and broad enough that two months of holiday are enjoyed in every year by most Laymen. Most Laymen also, take a vacation at one time, of a week or more. Nor does the year go by without a day here and a half day there, set free from business: so that the clergy are outnumbered fifty to one by the class who may if they choose—and it is the choice of most of them—have nearly if not quite one-fourth of the year to themselves. The minority is very small of the clergy who, even

with their demi-semi-Sabbath of Monday, enjoy an equal amount of holiday.

Now, in view of all this, is there any thing unreasonable in the amount of indulgence which the clergy have in taking holiday here and there throughout the year, as they can get it? No doubt they suit themselves therein as other men cannot. But the actual sum in days and weeks of this sort of indulgence being larger on the lay side, let the clerical advantage be ungrudged of greater freedom to consult their own pleasure.

We are quite aware that, in all that we have said we may seem to have been picking out the pettiest points of a very serious subject and giving them undue importance. It does not disturb us. That largeness of mind that looks down on petty things and is impatient of being detained among them fails, for the most part, to impress us, simply because it is so apt to be most loftily exhibited when the interests of other persons are concerned. The man who pooh-poohs the small anxieties and annoyances of other men, usually slaps his own mosquito as vigorously as any one does. These insect stings of petty criticism no practical mind ever overlooks, nor contemns the sensitiveness that is affected by them. They do not proceed always from pettiness of spirit, but are often the result of inconsiderateness. They are such remarks as are dropped casually when the current of light conversation touches on the subject. This is the kind of talk that your people most engage in; the source of many, if not most, of their opinions, the influence that largely shapes their estimate of things around them. And it is just in this style of conversation that the disparaging remarks about clergymen and clerical life of which we have been writing, are most frequent. It is no slight matter. It helps largely to form the disinclination to the clerical profession which most young men feel. When counteracted by deeper convictions and stronger feelings, it still remains to annoy and disturb the sensitiveness of spirit with which most young men appear before the world in the part which they have chosen. They like their choice to be thought well of. They keenly feel the little flings which society discharges like pellets as it were with the thumb and fore finger, against the "white choker" and the "black frock" and the professional ways of "the Parson," but which hit and smart like harder missiles sent with vigorous aim. It is well to

give such things some serious attention: to let it be seen that if we choose to enter the lists in such a contest, it is not the assailed who will be shamed.

If it were possible, we would deepen the solemnity of the process through which the Church brings her young men into Holy Orders. No word of instruction and warning, of her appeals to the heart and conscience should be omitted; not a tone of her voice should be made less awful. Nevertheless, there should be some place and mode found to recognize the fact that youth is still youth, even though set apart for the most sacred of offices. At some point of its course—rather at all points it should be made to feel that there is sympathy for those earthly hopes and fears, likings and longings, which as our nature is constituted, it would be simply monstrous for a young man not to have, whether his vocation be secular or sacred. The labor would not be lost were pains taken to strengthen our candidates for the ministry against this particular form of their trial. A Seminary Dean could hardly make better proof of the reality of his office than by manifesting an ever ready sympathy—the less formal the more effective—with these natural and not all culpable weaknesses of those over whom he has charge.

It would be no unworthy nor inefficient contribution to the increase of the Ministry, first, were it possible, to create a sound public sentiment as to the lawful forms and measures of clerical indulgence, and then, to give full and natural weight to all that, in this respect, is likely to attract a young man. Such influences are, doubtless, among the lowest to which he can be subjected. But in their measure they are lawful, and nothing that is lawful under the divine rule is really low. At all accounts till age, and the discipline of life, and the experience of his ministry, have matured his character, he will be susceptible to such influences to their full extent. They will not be more easily restrained within measure by ignoring them.

If there be any earthly attraction about clerical life, any special privilege, any indulgence that cannot be had elsewhere,—though ever so trivial in comparison with the grand principles and ends of the ministry—let it be openly claimed and maintained as such. The world at large will not less respect or trust the Ministry for the frank acknowledgment of this common bond of nature, “that

makes all men kin." They who are drawn into the ranks of the clergy will not be less firmly held to their high service for the grasp laid upon the weaker as well as the nobler part of their being.

ART. IX.—TRACTARIANISM AND VOLUNTARYISM.

DENOMINATIONAL religious organizations find relief for their internal difficulties by separation. They resemble families whose members unable to agree conclude to live apart. Such a remedy in the Church is prevented by the conservative power of our Episcopate. The election of the Bishop to a place in the Apostolic Succession, his solemn consecration to his holy office, the responsibilities of his lofty position, and the whole genius of his order make him regard schism at first with suspicion, and at last with horror: and this circumstance, combined with a latent attachment even in restless spirits to our Primitive form of Government, presents a barrier against disintegration. As the Episcopate preserved ecclesiastical unity in the early centuries of persecution when Christianity became diffused amid all the nations of the world, so is it our cohesive power in this age of divisions and revolutions. Perhaps this consideration more than any other explains why the Northern and Southern sections of the American Church, sundered for years by the fearful contests of civil war, were with the restoration of peace, brought at once into a complete and cordial harmony. But the very obstacles in the way of separation are arguments for our fraternal concord. If the family is compelled to dwell under the same roof conciliation becomes a necessity.

Yet with every conceivable inducement for unity, it cannot be disguised that our American Church is rent with the most deplorable divisions. Individuals are alienated. Households are disturbed. Parishes are divided. Conventions too often seem like battle-fields. Perhaps, more injurious than all, the two great sections of our mission work appear almost like hostile forces foraging in different territories, instead of being united by a common interest, a common sympathy and a common command in the same great object, at home and abroad, of evangelizing the entire world. Nay, schism has assumed the form of an organized defiance against the

lawful authority of the Church on the very ground that she has corrupted the Faith, and is hence incapable of proclaiming a pure Gospel.

To heal such divisions we have considered the chief aim of this Review. This single object explains the whole course of the present Editor. He has been hopeful of contributing something to such a result. He believes a magazine can be sustained wholly independent in its criticisms, and always before party placing the *Church*. On no other principle would the writer of this Article remain in his present position. He desires now to discharge a solemn duty by seeking the cause, and the remedy of our antagonisms. In such an inquiry he feels not the slightest regard for the interests of himself, or the criticisms of his adversaries. He has never in his editorial career written one single word of personal abuse, nor has he ever condescended to answer the falsehoods and misrepresentations with which he has been assailed. The noise of bloodless ecclesiastical battles has become a disregarded sound.

The general acquiescence in the provisions of the Canon amended by our last General Convention, shows that our differences do not originate in radical opposition to our Episcopal Order, and Apostolic Succession. Where the law of the Church is observed she cannot inquire into motives, or opinions. Nor would any view of the Holy Communion clearly distinguished from the monstrous absurdity of Transubstantiation seriously invade our peace. The root of our difficulties began in errors touching Baptism which seemed to assail that great central truth of the Christian system, and the Christian life which Saint Paul taught, and for which our Reformers died—the Justification of every penitent believer by Faith in the Righteousness of our atoning Lord regarded as expiating sin by His death upon the Cross.

The Scriptures constantly inculcate Faith, and Baptism, never exhibiting a suspicion of their antagonism. Both Greek, and Latin Fathers innocently follow their Lord, and His Apostles without dreaming that they taught hostile dogmas. The Reformers who expurgated our Liturgies, and compiled our Prayer Book were evidently under the same charming hallucination. We propose to quote at length the opinions of our standard Anglican Divines

showing how they followed undoubtingly in the path traced by the Church during so many centuries.

BAPTISM.

BISHOP JEWELL.

“Such a change is made in the Sacrament of Baptism. Through the power of God’s working the water is turned into blood. They that be washed in it receive the remission of their sins; their robes are made clean in the blood of the Lamb. By the authority thus of many ancient Fathers it is plain that, in the Sacrament of Baptism, by the sensible sign of the water, the invisible grace of God is given to us.”

HOOKER.

“Yet the grace which is given them with their Baptism, doth so far forth depend on the very outward Sacrament, that God will have it embraced not only as a sign, or token of what we receive, but also an instrument or means by which we receive grace, because Baptism is a Sacrament which God has instituted in His Church to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated with Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life.”

BISHOP ANDREWS.

“St. Paul tells that besides the circumcision that was the manufacture, there was another made without hands. This is so in Baptism; besides the hand seen that casts on the water, the virtue of the Holy Ghost is there.”

DONNE.

“The water of Baptism is the water that runs through all the Fathers. Therefore Tertullian makes the water the progress and the settled house, the voyage and the harbor, the circumference and centre of the Holy Ghost. And therefore St. Hierom calls these waters the mother of the world—to foreshadow that the water also should bring forth the Church—that the Church of God should be born in the Sacrament of Baptism.”

DR. JACKSON.

“It is then unsound and imperfect doctrine that original sin only is taken away, or remitted by Baptism, for whatsoever sins are remitted, or taken away by Christ’s death, the same sins are in the same manner remitted, or taken away by Baptism into His death. Actual sins are remitted in such as are guilty of actual sins when they are baptized, though original sin be actually remitted in those which are not guilty of actual sins as in infants.”

DR. BARROW.

“It hath been the doctrine constantly, and with consent delivered in the Catholic Church that on all persons by the Holy Mystery of Baptism initia-

ted to Christianity, or admitted into the communion of Christ's Body, the grace of God's Holy Spirit certainly is bestowed, enabling them to perform the conditions of piety and virtue then undertaken by them."

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL.

"We distinguish between the visible sign, and the invisible grace; between the exterior sacramental ablution and the grace of the Sacrament, that is interior regeneration. We believe that whosoever hath the former hath the latter also, so that he doth not put a hand to that sacrament by his infidelity, or by processes of which a child is not capable."

THORNDIKE.

"Yet is this no more than the regeneration of infants by water and the Holy Ghost imparteth; that the Spirit of God should be habitually present to make those reasons which God hath given to convince the world, that they ought to be Christians, both discernible to the understanding, and weighing down the choice.

BISHOP PEARSON.

"It is certain that the forgiveness of sins was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ, and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of baptism, did also receive the benefit of the ordinance, which is remission of sins."

BISHOP BULL.

"As if he had said, 'You have now God be thanked, escaped the pollutions of the world, and are truly, I hope converted to Christianity, and in Baptism have been regenerated by the Holy Ghost,' that he means by their being made partakers of the Divine Nature."

BISHOP KEN.

"Glory be to Thee, O most indulgent Love, who in our Baptism didst give us the Holy Spirit of Love, to be the principle of new life, and love in us, to infuse into our souls a preternatural and habitual grace to obey and love Thee."

COMBER.

Our praises must look back upon the grace already shown, and the benefits which are already given, which are principally two. 1. Internally, it is regenerated. 2. Externally, it is grafted into Christ's Church."

BISHOP PATRICK.

"Baptism, is the Sacrament of the new birth,—hereby He grants us remission of sin, and we are sanctified, and set apart to His use."

BISHOP SHERLOCK.

"By baptism we are declared to be such sons of God in whom He will delight, and whom He will appoint to be heirs of His kingdom. By Baptism we receive the promise of His Spirit, by which we can cry 'Abba Father.'

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

"But that we may be thus born of the Spirit we must be born of water, which our Saviour hath put in the first place, not as if there were any such virtue in water whereby it would regenerate, but because this is the rite or ordinance appointed by Christ wherein to regenerate by the Holy Ghost."

WATERLAND.

"The second is the case of infants. Their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not need, and of actual faith which they cannot have. They are capable of being savingly born of water and the Spirit, and of being adopted in sonship with what depends thereon."

BISHOP WILSON.

"The Holy Spirit at Baptism takes possession of us, and keeps possession till men grieve Him."

BISHOP HORNE.

"The first portion of sanctifying grace is given at Baptism, which is the seal of justification, and the beginning of sanctification, inasmuch as the sinner being thus sacramentally buried with Christ in His death arises with Him in the power of His resurrection, justified from the guilt of sin, through repentance and faith in His blood, and renewed into holiness by the operation of His Holy Spirit."

BISHOP HEBER.

"Justification, is the same with that regeneration of which Baptism is the outward symbol, and which marks out whenever it occurs—that it ordinarily occurs in Baptism I am for my part firmly persuaded—our admission into the number of the children of God, and the heirs of everlasting happiness."

BISHOP MANT.

"It should appear I say that He was here alluding by anticipation to that Sacrament of Baptism which He intended to ordain, and that supernatural grace, which was thereby to be confirmed through the instrumentality of water and by the Holy Ghost."

BISHOP JEBB.

"It is enough for us to believe and cherish the prevailing sentiment of the Universal Church, as it has been maintained from the age of the Apostles, that at the time of Baptism a new nature is divinely communicated, and gracious privileges are especially vouchsafed."

Here then we have the consensus of the Anglican Divines in regard to the Sacrament of Baptism. It will be seen also that they profess everywhere to interpret the Scriptures, and the Greek and Latin Fathers as expressing the uniform testimony of the Catholic Church. Their opinions are simply embodied and concentrated in our own Articles and Offices. All apparent contradictions and incon-

grinities seem removed by considering the substance of their teachings. 1. That Baptism in the case of infants is Regeneration, and removes the guilt of original sin. 2. That Baptism in the case of penitent adults is the sacramental sign of their New Birth, and their Forgiveness. 3. That Baptism is always regarded by the Church as an incorporation into the Kingdom of God. 4. That while Baptism is in this sense, the beginning of the Spiritual life, in the usual order of God's government, there are exceptional instances where it is not essential to Salvation. And here we believe, that all true members of the American Church could sufficiently unite in practical harmony had not disturbing elements been introduced hereafter to be noticed. Before proceeding to their consideration we will show how the Anglican writers express themselves in regard to that Faith which to the believing penitent is the sole indispensable condition of his Justification.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

“By faith we be justified before God—for faith maketh us partakers of the justice of Christ, and planteth us in Christ—and he that by true faith doth receive the promise of grace, to him God giveth the Holy Ghost, by which charity is spread abroad in our hearts which performeth all the commandments.”

BISHOP HOOPER.

“St. Paul when he saith we be justified by faith, meaneth that we have remission of sin, and are accepted into the favor of God by the merits of Christ.”

BISHOP LATIMER.

“Wherefore we must be justified, not through our good works, but through the passion of Christ, and so live by a free justification and righteousness in Christ Jesus. Whosoever thus *believeth*, mistrusting himself and his own doings, and trusting in the merits of Christ, he shall get the victory over death, the devil, and hell.”

WILLIAM PERKINS.

“A man is justified by faith alone, because faith is that alone instrument, created in the heart by the Holy Ghost, whereby a sinner layeth hold of Christ's righteousness, and applieth the same unto himself. There is neither hope, nor love, nor any grace of God within man, that can do this, but faith alone.”

HOOKER.

“This then is the sum of that which I say; Faith doth justify; justification washes away sin; sin removed, we are clothed with the righteousness

which is in God: the righteousness of God makes us most holy. Every one of these I have proved by the testimony of God's own mouth; therefore I conclude that faith is that which makes us most holy, in consideration whereof it is called in this place our most holy faith."

DR. JACKSON.

"Now the particular object of our faith, of that faith by which sins are remitted, whether by Baptism, or otherwise, is not our general belief in Christ! even our belief in Christ dying for us in particular will not suffice, unless it included our belief of the everlasting virtue of His Bloody Sacrifice, and of His everlasting Priesthood for purifying, and cleansing our souls."

BISHOP ANDREWS.

"I know Saint Paul saith much; That our Saviour Christ shed His blood to show His righteousness, that He might not only be just but a justifier of those that are of His faith." "As from the Brazen Serpent no virtue issued to heal, but unto them that steadily beheld it, so neither do these from Christ, but upon those that with the eye of faith have their contemplation on this object, who thereby draw life from Him."

ARCHBISHOP USHER.

"But how is the great benefit of Justification applied unto us, and apprehended by us? This is done on our part by faith alone, and that not considered as a virtue inherent in us working by love, but only as an instrument, or hand of the soul stretched forth to lay hold on the Lord our Righteousness. So that faith justifieth only relatively in respect to the object, which it fasteneth on, to wit, the Righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified. Faith being only the instrument to convey so great benefit unto the soul."

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

"And seeing the merit of Christ is made over unto us by our faith in Him, we are therefore said to be justified by faith, not as it is an act in us, but as it applies Christ to us. We are therefore said to be justified by faith in Christ, because we should not be justified by Christ without faith; wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely expressed in the Homily on Justification."

BISHOP HOPKINS.

"Justification is a gracious act of God whereby through the Righteousness of Christ's satisfaction imputed, He fully remits to the believing sinner the guilt and punishment of his sins, and through the Righteousness of Christ's perfect obedience imputed, He accounts him righteous and accepts him in love and favor, and unto eternal life. THIS IS JUSTIFICATION, WHICH IS THE VERY SUM AND PITH OF THE WHOLE GOSPEL, AND THE ONLY END OF THE COVENANT OF GRACE."

Thus we see how the consensus of the Anglican Divines is in accordance with the teachings of St. Paul, with the Greek and Latin

Fathers, and the Homilies and Articles of our Church. We are here plainly shown that whoever truly repents through the grace of the Holy Ghost, and by Faith trusts in the atoning death of our Lord Jesus Christ, receives the remission of his sins styled Justification, and an adoption among the children of God. Faith alone justifies, although the faith which justifies is not alone. With the pardon of sin is always associated that renewal of the Holy Ghost which leads to filial love, sincere submission, and cheerful obedience. Faith, being the principle of holiness instead of making void, establishes the law. And this is taught by the very venerable writers who inculcate that Baptism is a Sacrament of Regeneration.

But we proceed one step further. The most reliable Anglican Divines also inculcate that the faith of Justification may be accompanied by a direct attestation of the Holy Ghost. If this is not a necessary attainment of the Christian Life it is at least represented as a privilege of the Christian Life. We are now stating facts, without any minute analysis of theories.

ATTESTATION.

BISHOP ANDREWS.

"It is the proper effect of the love of Christ to cleanse our consciences from dead works to serve the living God, which, if we find it doth, Christ is come to us as He is to come, and the Spirit is come, and puts His Teste, and if we have His Teste we may go our way in peace; we have kept a right feast unto Him, and to the memory of His coming. Even so come Lord Jesus, and come, O blessed Spirit, and bear witness to our spirit that Christ's water, and His blood, we have ever part in both; both in the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness, and in the blood of the New Testament, the legacy whereof is everlasting life in the kingdom of glory."

HOOKER.

"Unto you, because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts to the end that ye might *know* that Christ hath built you on a rock immovable, and He hath registered your names in the Book of Life."

BISHOP BROWNRIGG.

"This is one great office of the Holy Ghost to ratify and seal up to us the forgiveness of our sins."

BISHOP PEARSON.

"It is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to

create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us the earnest of our everlasting inheritance. As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from Him our regeneration, so are we assured by the same Spirit of our adoption."

DR. BARROW.

"This is that Spirit of adoption which constituteth us the sons of God, qualifying us so to be by dispositions resembling God, and filial affections towards Him; certifying us that we are so, and causing us by a free instinct to cry, Abba, Father! running into His bosom of love, and flying under the wings of His mercy in all our needs, and distresses."

Certainly with such interpretations to our Prayer Book Anglican doctrine should not be misunderstood. Hooker more than any other single writer is the accepted exponent of the English Church. Does he in the immortal argument of his "Ecclesiastical Polity," demonstrate an Apostolic Episcopate perpetuated in an Apostolic Succession? Does he show from Holy Scripture and Ancient Fathers the institution of our ministerial order? Does he exhibit Baptism as the usual beginning, and the Eucharist as the principal perpetuation of the Divine Life? He, with the long unbroken line of the most profound, and venerated Scholars, and Doctors, and Bishops, testifies with equal distinctness to the truth of Justification by Faith, and of the assurance of Salvation precisely as set forth by the greatest Protestant writers without our Communion. Here the sincere Presbyterian, or Methodist would be willing to accept the instructions of Andrews, or Hooker, or Pearson, or Barrow. Thus every Churchman standing firmly, and forever by his Ordinal and his Sacramental Offices, is bound in heart and doctrine and experience to millions of noble spirits in all parts of Christendom. He may be true to every rubric, and every observance, and every inculcation of his Prayer Book; and have as the centre of his spiritual being that very doctrine of Justification by faith with which Luther shook Rome, and which Calvin so zealously defended, and to which Protestantism clings at this hour as the hope of the individual and of the world. Nay, the completeness of his character and the harmony of his life depend on uniting what God has joined, and party has divided. Less than fifty years since unity on these points was our perpetual boast and glory. Our past differences seem so slight in the retrospect compared with our present divergence, that, like parallel lines, prolonged before the eye, they fade into each other. What then has caused our de-

plorable extremes? We have no hesitation in saying they had their chief origin in connection with the Tractarian Movement. To make this plain we must trace the events which gave it birth.

After the Reformation had established the Anglican Church substantially in its present form, its entanglements with the State were continually impeding its spiritual development. Elizabeth seems always to have been wavering in her attachment, and vacillating in her opinions, and was more anxious for a hierarchy to assist her government than a religion to save her soul. The subsequent reigns of the century marked by ecclesiastical exaction and puritanical intolerance, and royal dissoluteness and jesuitical falsehood, and dutch contempt, although abounding in instances of beautiful piety, and brilliant eloquence, and profound learning, certainly did not accomplish much in promoting the faith, or improving the morals of the English nation. During the earlier periods of the Hanoverian dynasty, skepticism was rather the rule than the exception among nobles, and scholars, and people. The gigantic and unparalleled labors of Wesley and Whitefield arrested the headlong ruin. Well would it have been for the Church had her Bishops legalized the eccentricities of such zeal, and piety and genius. But the Apostle of this reform renounced his belief in the Episcopacy as a divine institution, and by an unwarantable ordination prepared an inevitable schism. Besides, the mighty preachers of the Methodist Reform in their zeal for faith and experience, overlooked order and observance. They raised up around them many clergymen of the establishment who became itinerant evangelists, hostile to the catholicity of the Church, and only sympathizing with its Protestantism. In the other extreme were Bishops nominated by godless Ministers, and Rectors appointed by godless Lords, whose dissoluteness was a public scandal. Can it be wonderful that worldliness and enthusiasm should together have devastated the Church? Its Order was too often despised. Its Sacraments were neglected. Its Fasts and Feasts were unobserved. Its cathedrals were deserted and decayed. Faith, Doctrine, Piety, exhibited together a sisterhood of suffering. Noble spirits in the nineteenth century rushed to the rescue, as noble spirits had been called forth in the eighteenth century. Oxford was the birth-place of two movements impelled by precisely opposite poles of influence. One was to revive Faith: the other

was to revive Order. One was to promote experience; the other was to promote observance. One was to overthrow the Apostolical Succession, and the other was to inspire reverence for its claims. One was to depreciate, and the other was to elevate Sacraments. One was the necessity and the complement of the other. And it is perfectly certain that Tractarianism in its early stages never contemplated any alliance with Rome. Indeed, it boasted itself the “*via media*.” It asserted that

“Methodism and Popery are in different ways the refuge of those whom the Church stints of the gifts of grace;” and that “the Pope has encroached on the rights of the Churches.”

How strangely now will sound to some of its grand-children, the opinion which we quote :

“Surely before the blessing of a millenium were vouchsafed to us, the whole Christian world has much to confess in its various branches. Rome has to confess her Papal corruptions, and her cruelty towards those who refuse to accept them. The Christian Communion of our own land, and Scotland, and other countries, their neglect of the Apostolical Order of ministers. **THE GREEK CHURCH HAS TO CONFESS ITS SAINT-WORSHIP**; its formal fasts; its want of zeal. The Church of Asia their heresy.” “Luther, and his associates, upheld in the main the true doctrine, and though it is not necessary to defend every act of fallible men like them, yet we are fully justified in maintaining that the conduct of those who defended the truth against the Romish party, even in opposition to the spiritual rulers, is worthy of great praise.” “I look upon our Articles as in one sense an addition to the Creeds, and at the same time the Romanists added their Tridentine Articles. Them I consider unsound—ours true.” “I would have the Church do the same thing now, if I could; she should not *change the Articles*; she should add to them.” “I further maintain that while I fully concur in the Articles as far as they go, they who call us Papists do not concur in the doctrine of the Liturgy.”

It is thus demonstrable that the Tractarians at first simply aimed to revive the Catholic order and observance of the Church, but not to change her Protestant position. While they occupy this ground, and defend the received Anglican view of the Sacraments, it is marvelous with what point, and power and unction they write. Their words of flame kindled the Church over the world. But gradually their object shifts. They begin with a tame apology for the Anglican position. They speak with tolerance of some more innocent Romish practices. They depart from their Protestant attitude of stern, uncompromising, perpetual opposition to

Popish usurpations and corruptions. They end by an endeavor to reconcile English Articles and Tridentine Canons. When the barriers were thus cut away, of course a wavering multitude rushed over on the impetuous torrent. Rome has eagerly watched the wrecks, and borne away into her harbor with triumph the brightest genius of the century, and a zealous disciple who may yet be a Pope, and Clergymen almost numberless, and noblemen whose aggregated estates would support without exhaustion the splendor of the Vatican and the pageantry of St. Peter's. Now that the dogma of Infallibility presents an insurmountable barrier to reunion, it is seen that Eirenicons instead of promoting peace, have been multiplying perverts.

But after all the most startling departure remains to be noticed. We have seen the Anglican teaching in regard to Baptism and Faith. Some divines of the Oxford school, inculcated what was utterly alien to the standards of the English Church. One writer, approved by its acknowledged organ, maintained

"That our being reckoned righteous before God, always and essentially, implies a substance of righteousness previously implanted in us, and that our reputative justification is the strict and inseparable result of this previous efficient moral justification. I mean, that the reckoning us righteous indispensably presupposes an inward reality of righteousness on which this reckoning is founded." Mr. Newman writes: "Justification consists in God's inward presence. It is the act of God imparting His divine presence to the soul through Baptism, and so making us the temples of the Holy Ghost." "Christ is our righteousness by dwelling in us, and by His Spirit, justifies us by entering in us, and continues to justify by remaining in us."

Mr. Pusey does not seem, in his tract on Baptism, to have taught such views. Yet he certainly employed language different from the Anglican consensus, when he writes:

"In these events we are spoken of as *passive only*; we did nothing for ourselves; we *were* baptized, buried, planted, crucified; the very language marks that all this was God's doing in us and for us. We had no more to do with it than a man hath with burying or crucifying himself."

The atonement, too, was hailed as a mystery, only discernible by the delicate vision of the spiritual few, not proclaimed as a great fact, boldly and constantly before the world, as the only hope of the sinner. Man was, by some of these writers, sent for pardon to something wrought by grace in his own heart, and not to the Cross directly as his salvation. Surely it was to be ex-

pected that those who loved the Anglican Reformation, the Anglican Articles and the Anglican Divines, should be confounded and alarmed by such statements. The excitement and the opposition which ensued were inevitable. It was hard to draw a distinction between the views at least of Mr. Knox and Mr. Newman, and the Tridentine doctrine. It was impossible for many minds to perceive any essential divergence, in the extracts given, from the famous canon, declaring

"If any man shall say that the good works of a justified person are the gifts of God, in such a manner that they are not also the justified person's merits, in that the justified person does not truly deserve increase of grace and eternal life, and, upon condition that he die in the grace of God, the obtaining of eternal life, and also an increase of grace, by those good works which he does by the grace of God, and the merit of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member—let him be accursed."

We do not affirm that Tractarianism intended to teach the Roman error. Possibly its meaning was misconceived. But its views were astounding to those who had read the powerful words of Hooker in his Discourse on Justification, where he says:

"This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread. When they speak of the first or second Justification, they make the essence a divine quality inherent; they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us, then it is ours, as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him; for, if He withdraw the breath of our nostrils we fall into dust. But the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own. Therefore we cannot be justified by *any* inherent quality. The Church of Rome in teaching Justification by inherent grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ, and by the hands of the Apostles 'we have received otherwise than she teacheth.'

That the Oxford divines designed to teach what their words appear to indicate, is certainly made more probable by a recent development. Keble is represented in his Biography by Sir John Coleridge, as contemptuously calling the doctrine of Justification by Faith a "tradition." At this distance of time, when passion has subsided, we can calmly contemplate this controversy. Without at all deciding what the extreme Tractarian school intended, it may be safely asserted that to send a penitent into his own heart for the comfort of pardon, is essential Popery. Such a direction subverts the very foundations of the Gospel. It overthrows the established distinction between Justification and Sanctification. It

points a man to himself, instead of the Cross. It confuses, by encouraging a subtle analysis of states and experiences. It disturbs peace, it discourages hope, it clouds joy by turning faith from that righteousness of our atoning Lord, which is our only refuge and our eternal glory. It tends to substitute a work in the creature **for** the merit of the Saviour. It weakens all the springs of the spiritual life. The penitent turned from Christ to himself, with a painful feeling of darkness, and languor and deficiency, is prepared to complete an acceptable righteousness by mere legal works. Here Rome has laid her foundations for penance, and confession, and indulgences; and saint-merit, saint-worship, and saint-mediation; and absolution, and purgatory, and mass: and a whole system of mediaeval error which substitutes the Priest for our Saviour, and places at the disposal of man the salvation of God. We do not assert that this was at all contemplated by any Tractarians. But we do affirm, whatever was their meaning, that the language of some of their number was so entire a departure from the received Anglican interpretation of the Gospel, as recorded in Homilies, and Articles and Divines, that Churchmen had a right to feel alarm. They did feel alarm. Unfortunately that alarm assumed an organized form. Whatever effect Tractarianism temporarily produced, and however it may now be received by certain extremists, it has certainly not been adopted by the American Church. Justification by any infusion of grace, has never been taught in our General Theological Seminary. It is not inculcated by our standard Divines. It is not proclaimed in our prominent pulpits. The writer has heard the same doctrine from the eloquent Bishop of Ohio, which attracts within the walls of St. Thomas, and impresses beneath the arches of Old Trinity. His observation leads him to believe there is a substantial unity in regard to the great central truth of a sinner's justification in the different sections of the Church. Therefore it would seem to have been the wiser policy for Protestant Churchmen, justly alarmed, to have awaited the subsidence of passion, and to have used their influence within the legitimate agencies of the Church, and above all things, to have avoided making their differences permanent by organization. We can conceive nothing more unfortunate than any association instituted to perform any work in any instance where the Church has herself legislated; and by no other body in the world than our

own General Convention would such action for one moment be tolerated. Yet there was strong provocation, and such liberties have been for years overlooked. Every day we are reaping the terrible harvest from seeds dropped into the soil of the Church at a crisis of excusable and righteous apprehension.

We must, therefore, regard antagonistic organizations as a fact. The evil can now find its remedy not so much by violence, as by compromise. Is there any method by which this deadly cancer can be removed from the bosom of the Church? Until the disease is cured all her movements will be retarded, and her triumphs deferred.

It has been remarked that the doctrine of Baptismal Justification, which seems inferrible from some of the Oxford school, is not at present widely accepted in the American Church. Is there any other tangible evil which some loyal men trace to Tractarianism? However unjust their inference, the question must be affirmatively answered. Many philosophic minds consider Ritualism as the outgrowth of the Oxford Movement. It certainly finds a centre in Oxford University, and has supporters among Oxford Collegians. Now Ritualism has entrenched itself chiefly within a single citadel of this country. There, to this day, its banner floats in defiance of all law. Bishops have individually protested. The General Convention has mildly legislated. The United Episcopate has issued a noble address. Canon, argument and remonstrance have not availed. Around its American centre Ritualism has gathered an English literature teaching the invocation of Saints, priestly absolution, virtual transubstantiation, and a whole cluster of mediæval errors. We believe there can be no peace until that stronghold is demolished, not by the ordinary process of trial, but by the legislative action of the General Convention. There is something in the presentation of a Clergyman from which manly natures shrink. The part of a spy in seeking evidence which will convict, is invidious and detestable. Beside, the excitements of an ecclesiastical trial engender bitterness, and too often lower the dignity of the Church and injure the morals of society. The anomalous want of a Supreme Appellate Court also makes any particular decision merely local in its application, so that what may be law in one Diocese is offence in another. Moreover, there are always evasions by which the accused may escape

justice, and one of the most disastrous results of modern Ritualism is its tendency to conceal its Romish counterfeits and illegal practices. The very altar of God has witnessed subterfuges which seem far removed from the simplicity and directness of Christian integrity. Everything then points to a decided action on the part of our next General Convention. Its warnings and counsels have been unheeded. Let it now vindicate its dignity, and assert its authority by a resolution of absolute and perpetual suppression. We can conceive nothing more wise, and nothing more noble. If the Church has been misconstrued, if the mere opinions of individuals have been regarded as the doctrines of the majority, if there has been a hostile and schismatic system of Voluntaryism, let it be remembered that there was much to excite suspicion of departure from our Anglican standards; that there have been multiplied secessions to the Papacy, and that Ritualistic practices expressing Romish doctrine which have been pronounced illegal by the highest Courts of England, are still permitted in America against the united wishes of our Episcopate, and the known resolution of the General Convention. There is nothing so much as the action indicated that will heal wounds, allay suspicions, restore confidence, and harmonize all loyal men in the different sections of the Church. Indeed until we have a bold and unmistakable vindication of the majesty of law, carrying with it proof that our Catholic sympathies have not weakened our Protestant principles, there can never in this country be anything but war and humiliation.

Now suppose loyal Churchmen, from every quarter, unite in support of the measure we have advocated. Then can be approached the whole subject of Voluntaryism. The dignity of the General Convention indeed required the immediate suppression of every organization hostile to its own societies. It feared however to assert its power; nothing now remains but to deal with a permitted fact. Compromise and not compulsion, is the plain remedy. After the legislation described, a committee wisely composed of representative men would be prepared for the consideration of a measure of consolidation. Thus we might see once more all the contributions of the Church for the education of our ministry, the diffusion of religious knowledge, and the evangelization of the world, flow into the common treasury of our Master. Thus would

be avoided the scandal involved in the spectacle of men ordained by the same Episcopate, bound by the same vows, using the same Liturgy, subscribing the same Articles, and yet belonging to antagonistic organizations, one charging heresy, and the other charging schism. Thus would we escape those feelings of littleness and alienation caused by every parish collection, by every quarterly missionary celebration, and above all by those annual demonstrations which inflict so much pain, and excite so much opposition. Thus would we behold the entire Church united in the entire work of converting the entire world to our Lord. May not the accomplished union of the great religious bodies, receiving the same standards, yet alienated by years of strife, be a stimulus to our efforts in promoting harmony! Much more should we not recall the noble spectacle, so full of love, and majesty, when the northern and southern sections of the American Church became forever one in heart and organization, as they were one in Faith and Order!

And here we venture to suggest that our Baptismal Service, and our Articles, equally express the Anglican consensus. A change in the first by one section, will prepare for a change in the second by the other section. And are not alternative phrases, but authorized and perpetuated differences of opinion? What could be more unfortunate than to make a sacramental office a party badge? The Bishops who have lent their names to the movement which would terminate in a result so disastrous, have not followed their own wishes, but simply sought to relieve their troubled brethren. May we not therefore hope that the action of the General Convention we have before indicated in regard to Ritualism, would appease the disappointment to be caused by the inevitable denial of a request to alter the Baptismal Office, and thus prevent a threatened schism? Restored confidence would speedily dissipate all the lesser clouds of disaffection. Where love rules captiousness disappears.

There is certainly, however, a rising difficulty in another direction which yet our wisdom can overcome. We have seen all visions of intercommunion with Rome scattered by the declaration of Papal Infallibility. Few of even the most extreme will be so blinded by schemes of impossible unity as to admit a changeless dogma which virtually makes a mortal God; which chains the

world to the Vatican ; which constitutes the representative of St. Peter not only an unerring oracle, but a universal sovereign ; which sanctifies error, justifies persecution, and stamps with truth and justice, and charity the enormities of more than ten centuries. Just, however, in proportion to our disappointment in regard to the Latin Church will the current rush with increased violence towards the Greek Church. Here, we believe, that the conservative wisdom of our General Convention will be exhibited. May we not, however, suggest that without internal unity the desire for external unity is vain ? How can a divided household preach reconciliation ? How can warring men proclaim peace ? How can those unreconciled in the same communion bend all their efforts to harmonize different communions ? Our first, our greatest, our noblest aim, should be concord among ourselves. Christian brethren must promote love more by example than by words. Let our chief aim be peace at home. There are men in our midst from both parties who believe that the protests of our Articles against idolatry and transubstantiation, apply equally to the Greek and Latin Churches ; and who, like their ancestors, would resist every effort towards compromise, conceding a single position for which our Fathers shed their blood. There can never be communion except on the basis of Reformation. Mere words are nothing. Measures towards unity, unless meaningless, must pass into action. If the questions of Order and the Creed were adjusted, the Oriental Liturgies must be absolutely purified, before the services of our Churches can be interchangeable. Will an Anglican priest kiss the icons ? Will a Greek priest abstain from kissing the icons ? Will an Anglican priest invoke the Virgin ? Will a Greek priest abstain from invoking the Virgin ? Will an Anglican priest worship the host ? Will a Greek priest abstain from worshiping the host ? Surely here are difficulties at present insurmountable. When we consider that before there can be any practical intercommunion, all the views of the Eastern Church in regard to Orders must be abandoned ; when we consider that both the English Church and the American Church will have to make an important change in the Nicene Creed ; when we consider that all the Oriental Liturgies must be expurgated, we may well hesitate to produce greater alienation at home by chasing visions of unity abroad. Surely our losses through our Romish dreams, finally

terminated by the barrier of Infallibility, should be a lesson of warning. We are told already that Greek priests in England and America are preparing to establish Parishes, and gather our wavering sheep. Let us remember that while on our side Assemblies and Conventions and Convocations have been passionate in their advances, on the other side there has been nothing but the fraternal expressions of individual Prelates, conceding no principle, and intended to concede no principle. Let us seek for unity. Let us pray for unity. But let it be unity on the principles of that English Reformation which restored to the world the purity of the Apostolic Church, untarnished in its Faith, and unbroken in its Order, and therefore to be at last the hope, and light, and glory of Christendom!

Before closing our Article we are compelled to admit, that if the recent decision of the Court of Arches in the case of Mr. Bennet should be sustained by the Privy Council, and widely adopted by the American Church, the difficulties in the way of peace would be endlessly complicated. Let us inquire for a moment what is tolerated by the English Ecclesiastical Law, according to the decision of Sir Robert Phillimore as a judge, and what is believed by him as an individual. Admit that by the word of a Priest there is with the elements on the altar a localized, exterior, objective Presence of our Lord. For what is it there? To be adored? But, both by its genius, and its institution, *participation*, not worship, is the object of the Holy Eucharist. The recipient, with the bread and wine, must *feed* on the Body and Blood of Christ. How? Through his lips? Then physical organs must masticate spiritual aliment. The material takes, eats, digests the intangible, the invisible, the impalpable. This is absurd. Therefore the reception must be by Faith. This, however, is interior. This acts within the soul, and not without. This cannot go out to apprehend the objective, and exterior. Hence Christ enters the "heart," where we "feed on Him," "with thanksgiving." Hence our Article says, "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only* after a *heavenly* and *spiritual* manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is *Faith*." Hence in our Catechism we teach the same doctrine to our very children. We confess that if our choice was between the Objective Presence of Mr. Cobb and the Transubstantiation of

Trent, we should prefer the latter. The old Roman manducation is a single act. The new Anglican manducation perplexes by the double operation of receiving through the lips, at the same time, a physical and a spiritual substance, while it utterly confounds the office of the mouth and the office of the faith. There can, therefore, be no possible reason why the Body and Blood of our Saviour should be locally on the altar, unless Sacrifice and Adoration are the chief objects of the Holy Eucharist. On the contrary, *participation* is the characteristic of the mystery.

Perhaps the readers of this REVIEW have, within this year, noticed Essays entitled "Advanced Ritualism," "The Liturgy, and The Articles," and "The Greek Church." They were not written without design, without care, or without consultation. They are believed to embody true Anglican principles. They seek to express the harmony of the Catholic and the Protestant elements of the Church. They would present a basis on which loyal men of all parties may stand in defence of Truth. To sustain his course the Editor appeals to the sense and piety of true men in every section of the Church. Nor does he doubt the final triumph of the great principles he deems it the highest privilege of his life to vindicate. He would adopt as a motto—INTERNAL UNITY ON THE BASIS OF BOTH OUR CATHOLICITY AND OUR PROTESTANTISM: EXTERNAL UNITY ONLY ON THE BASIS OF A GREEK AND LATIN REFORMATION.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. *Its History, Principles, and Results. A. D. 1514, 1547.* By the REV. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M. A. F. S. A.; Vicar of Kennington, Oxford; Editor of the "Annotated Book of Common Prayer;" Author of "Directorium Pastorale," etc. Rivingtons, London, Oxford and Cambridge. Pott & Amery, New York, 1870.

We have always supposed that the real basis of the Roman Theology is its inculcation touching the merit of the creature. It gathers and concentrates itself in the Tridentine Canon on Justification, quoted in the last Article of our present number. Hence the whole structure of works of supererogation and the mediation of Saints. Both Continental and Anglican Reformers assailed the vast and central error of Rome by the doctrine of a sinner's Justification by Faith as taught by St. Paul. This sweeps away at a stroke hoary dogmas and practices which enchain and blinded Christendom for ages. The soul, suddenly aroused from centuries of superstition and stupor, hungered and thirsted for Divine Truth, and nothing in the Reformation is more marvelous than the avidity with which the people read the translated Scriptures, and received the revived teaching in regard to Faith. These mighty spiritual impulses were most characteristic of the era, and while in Germany they frequently burst forth into a wild fanaticism, in England they were subdued and controlled, and finally pervaded and shaped the whole theology of the Anglican Divines. The boast and glory of our Fathers have always been that they restored the great doctrine of Justification by Faith to its place in the Christian system, and at the same time preserved the Apostolic Order in its integrity and the Primitive Sacraments in their purity. Have we been dreaming? Have we totally misunderstood our English standards? Have we utterly misconceived the Anglican Divines? If Mr. Blunt is correct in his history, we acknowledge a hopeless deficiency in ordinary understanding. He entirely ignores the doctrinal work of the Reformation, and proposes the scheme of Wolsey as furnishing its truest model. That the Cardinal has been misunderstood and misrepresented, we heartily concede. He was certainly a man of masterly genius, and kind heart, far in advance of his age, and moving in a world infinitely higher than that of the narrow priests and politicians by whom he was surrounded. If his ambition was large, it was magnificent, and while seeking brilliancy for his own fame, he contemplated vast benefit for his nation. But should we accept his plan of Reform as an ultimatum, Romanism at this hour would be the religion of Britain. The history of Mr. Blunt is simply designed so to exalt the Catholic element of the Church of England as forever to obliterate its Protestantism. To accept its theories is to deny the great central truths for which our Fathers battled and died. We will let our author speak for himself.

"That which we shall thus gather it will be convenient to state in a summary form at the outset, and supposing that Wolsey had, in the early part of his public life, formed a complete and definite plan of his intentions as to the Reformation of the Church of England, we might imagine him to have condensed them into the following plan:

1. To provide a better educated class of clergy by founding Professorships at the Universities, by building new Colleges, and by establishing Schools similar to Winchester and Eton as feeders for them.

2. To have a general visitation of the Clergy and the monks by a central and supreme authority, which could not be resisted for the purpose of restoring sound discipline as to morals, and for enforcing strict performance of duties.

3. To found new Bishoprics in the large towns, out of the great monasteries already existing there.

4. To conciliate the King, the old-fashioned Bishops, and the obstructive party generally, by opposing the importation of foreign elements, such as Lutheranism, into the Universities or elsewhere.

5. To practice toleration as far as possible towards hot-headed Reformers, and to give employment in the new Colleges to the best and most learned of them.

6. To promote theological learning by encouraging the study of the Greek, and by enriching the libraries of the Universities.

7. To obtain the fullest authority possible from the Pope, and the King, for carrying out these reforms, and to seek the Papedom itself that they might be extended to the Church at large.

The splendor of this noble programme is not lessened by the consideration that it was very unlikely Wolsey would form so full and definite a plan at the outset of his career. Even if we extend it over fifteen years, from 1514 to 1529, and allow that it formed only a portion of the great schemes which passed through the brain of one who was far the greatest political ruler England had yet seen, *we must still acknowledge that it was the most comprehensive view of Church reform that was ever contemplated, and one before which the actual Reformation shrinks into a confused mass of half-accomplished good and unobstructed evil.*"

When we remember that Wolsey was always a loyal son of Rome, who never renounced a single iota of her superstitious dogmas, the words we have italicised certainly seem astounding. After such a statement we do not wonder that Mr. Blunt accepts as the doctrine of the Church of England the Faith of the Ten Articles issued in the mere twilight of the Reformation. We will quote a portion of it and add his remarks:

"Under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained, and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered on the Cross for our redemption, and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine, the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporally, really and in substance exhibited, distributed, and received of all them which receive the Sacrament."

"It will be observed that this is a full and firm assertion of the doctrine of the Real Presence as it is, and always has been held by High-Church Divines in the Church of England."

If this assertion were true we would advocate another Reformation. Thank Heaven that we have reason to believe such a view has not been widely adopted in America!

THE LAY READER. *A Series of Sermons for the Christian Year.* By JOHN N. NORTON, Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky., &c. Philadelphia, Richard McCauley, 1314 Chestnut St., 1870.

We took up these sermons in our ignorance of their author, with very meagre expectations, and we laid them down with the certainty that they are very admirable. They are not scholarly, elaborate or rounded discourses: but they are plain, concrete, pointed, hitting squarely some mark, and the very opposite of what we call dull. We should never expect to find Mr. Norton's parish Church a comfortable place for a Sunday's nap, and he must be a living man speaking living words that rouse men from the death of trespasses and sins. These sermons which have in them a certain American flavor of Western origin, we commend as lively expressions of some of the most lively truths of the word of God.

HOMILETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., &c. Eighth Edition. New York, Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, 1870.

The substance of this book consists of lectures delivered in Auburn Theological Seminary in 1852-3, and like every thing which passes out of the author's brain into print is grave, and full of plain Saxon sense. As its name implies, this is a volume of instruction about the very ancient, difficult and still disputed matter of sermonizing. In general what it says about this art is sensible and sometimes far-sighted and profound. The conscientious man skilled in such subtle work—the man who regards the preaching of the Word as the first of arts, where one speaking rightly of God, knows his eloquence to need, above all, the grace of God in him who speaks and him who hears, and therefore writes as it were upon his knees before his God, words earnest and full of the flavor of his own soul,—will find in Professor Shedd's advice to theological students many things which his own experience has taught him. And though every true preacher must after all go his own way to his own work, there are many things in this book which any sacred orator might read with thanks, and find of use. In the Chapter on "The nature and choice of a text," there are some rare bits of what we may call the humorous side of texts in their application, as for instance when one Englishman preached from Acts xvi. 30, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" a sermon on the divine right of Episcopacy. Since St. Paul and Silas are called "Sirs" and "Sirs" being in the Greek *κύριοι*, meaning "Lords," it is perfectly plain that at that time Episcopacy was not only the acknowledged government, but bishops were peers of the realm and so ought to sit in the House of Lords. Another preached in King Charles II's time from the text "Seek first the kingdom of God" a sermon to show that a king's government is most in accordance with the will of God. "For said the preacher, it is not said seek the *parliament* of God, the *army* of God, or the *Committee of Safety* of God, but it is Seek the *Kingdom* of God."

The part of the Professor's book on Pastoral Theology, discloses a reverent Puritan mind, toned and softened in the atmosphere of the XIXth Century.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. *By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., &c. Vols. I. & II. Third Edition. New York, Charles Scribner & Co. 654 Broadway, 1870.*

Whatever Prof Shedd writes is sure to be treated with great respect by every thinker in the realm of philosophy and religion, even by those most questioning his conclusions, since he is a man sincere, of sound learning and metaphysical acumen, who years ago in his Edition of Coleridge's works showed what stuff was in him. As a Churchman, we can never understand how to the Puritan, or man who disbelieves Christ's Church to be an historic, organic and ever living whole—as a tree putting out diverse branches, losing some, others being dead, yet the same tree nevertheless—but holds that the Church is to reproduce itself everywhere in isolated congregations—there can be any true or connected Church history at all. Yet our Puritan friends (and the Professor is one), often show great industry in Ecclesiastical studies—as these volumes prove.

From vol. I. after laying down the principles of his science, he discusses the influences of heathen and mediaeval philosophers on Christianity down to this age: the history of the attack and defence of the Faith, as between heretics and Catholics; and above all the Trinitarianism of the Church, both before and after Nicea, in its influence on the mind and life of the Faithful. In vol. II. he tells the story of the other great Church ideas, embraced in the words Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The field is wide and rich, but often examined, and the Rev. Doctor, if he has said nothing really new, has so at least arranged and marshalled old facts, that his students may get a very clear idea of the development of Christian doctrine. And as far as most men may, standing outside an historic Church, our author has grasped firmly on their intellectual side, the great questions of Humanity and God, which have served so long as exercises for scholars, and are the deep foundations of the faith of the millions. We know of no recent theological work this side the water, which shows more grasp and research, and is more clearly cut and shaped than this.

CHRISTIANITY AND GREEK PHILOSOPHY, Or the Relation between spontaneous and reflective Thought in Greece, and the positive Teaching of Christ and His Apostles. *By B. F. COCKER, D.D., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.*

A thick book of 531 pages filled full of hard, keen thought about the deepest questions, touching man by nature and by Grace, and especially as he shows himself in the Classic Hellenic garb of Plato and Socrates, may serve as an outside description of a book creditable in many ways to American thought and literature. A clear-headed, patiently-searching, scholarly man wrote it. Its title explains its purpose well enough. In his inquiry into the relations of Greek philosophy to Christianity which he prefaces with that quotation from St. Augustine, "Plato made us know the true God, Jesus Christ showed us the way to Him," an inquiry as all may see down among the very roots of human thought, he shows us many singular things con-

cerning that "fullness of time," of which Scripture speaks, and the preparation of the world for the Incarnation. Heathen philosophy, *in* Greece and *from* Greece was ever a search after God; and the men who came nearest to finding Him, were, as we think, Socrates and Plato; and still they found Him only behind veils and clouds, but never upon a Cross. The prime defect of all the Greek philosophies was in their inability to satisfy the broken law of God. That God should sacrifice His Son, was entirely beyond their reach. The true fullness that filled even the Divine Law to satisfy it was in Jesus Christ.

It only remains to say that it is one of the singular qualities of this work that it was written by a resident of our West, in a State which forty years ago was a howling wilderness. Since Plato speaks even on the prairie, what news shall we not sooner or later hear from that quarter? The politicians are saying that the West is soon to be the centre of political power. However that may be, every now and then a new book born in that region makes its way in upon us, and we confess they show something, as in this book, which impresses us with a sense of the coming greatness of the West even in literature, and that somewhere, under the shadows of the Rocky Mountains and by her great rivers the so called West of these United States is to become the home of a great cultured and artistic civilization.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRISON ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK. *For the year 1869.*

We know of no humane book published in a twelvemonth, more interesting to the Christian and the philanthropist than this. Dr. Wines, the Secretary of the Association, has made it a Year Book of Prison scenes; and these Reports as they continue will soon form an Encyclopedia of information touching our prisons. Both here and in Europe able and devoted men have written for this annual, the best and wisest things. The readers of the Church Review may pass by these lines without notice, but they are written down to declare as provable beyond dispute, that the American prison system is already a vast interest of money and morality, and must become more so; that it is to the last degree unscientific and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it costs more than it should and is vastly behind doing all the good that it ought; that to-day it is the great shame and evil in our American institutions despite all the labors of Prison Associations; that it needs and will have a reformation; that it must be taken utterly out of politics, and put on a scientific basis; and that the way to do this great work is to rouse the American people to its necessity, and then put it in the hands of just such men as the members of the Prison Association of New York, and let them in the name of Humanity and God deliver us from a system that destroys the prisoner and burdens the citizen with debt.

We stand ready to show any Bishop of this Church a new opening for church work in connection with prisons, which cannot but be acceptable to Him who has spoken it for our behoof—"I was sick and in prison, and ye came unto me."

THE NATIONS AROUND. *By A. KEARY. Author of "Early Egyptian History."* Macmillan & Co., Publishers. 1870.

"The Nations Around" turns out to be a history of the singular customs and manners of those ancient heathen races, the Egyptians, Phoenicians, Chaldeans, and the like who dwelt *around* the Jews from the early ages, and toned the Hebrew national life in many ways. It therefore illustrates many passages in Holy Writ, and as it was written for a Christian's reading on Sundays, so God's Word has often a more intelligent meaning for those who are acquainted with Mr. Keary's pages. He shows himself to be widely learned in ancient lore, and to have the power of throwing away all useless lumber and building with an artist's skill out of choice material a beautiful house of history wherein everything is bright, clear and shining. There are other books, like Wilkinson's and Layard's, that contain more details of Egyptian and Chaldean history, but we know of no book that on these subjects as related to God's Word, contains so much real wheat of instruction, or is so valuable to the general Christian reader. It is published in exquisite taste, and we hereby without fear of wise contradiction commend it to all parents for themselves and children. It is reading for any day, and ought to be in every library.

THE THREEFOLD GRACE OF THE HOLY TRINITY. *By JOHN H. EGAR, B. D. Rector of St. Peter's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.*

It lies within the range of criticism, and not against personal courtesy to say, that the writer of this book is of Western strain and culture, and has been for some time known to many to be of a far-reaching and subtle mind fit as human nature reverently may, to reach out after some of the most recondite matters of our Holy Faith. What he attempts in this work may be seen well enough in these extracts from it. Our knowledge of God is not knowledge of Him in Himself apart from us, but knowledge of Him in relation to us. Our faith in the Holy Trinity is the highest reach of thought, above which it cannot ascend into a philosophy of the Absolute, such as has been vainly imagined possible; it is rather the starting point from which reason may descend to the world and to ourselves. (p. 43.)

"The work of Redemption is a complex operation of the Three Divine Persons, in which each bears his own distinctive part. There is an operation of the Father, an operation of the Son distinct from that of the Father, and an operation of the Holy Ghost distinct from those of the Father and the Son. The knowledge that these operations are effectually performed in us to our salvation, gives us the only well-grounded comfort and Christian joy." p. 46.

It is true that this book is able, subtle, and puts old truth into a fresh and available form, so that the thoughtful Christian mind will be quickened in its faith by these new utterances; and it is no mean contribution to American theology, having a certain ripeness and patience in it evidently won from the study of the blessed Patriarchs and Fathers. But while we confess so much in its praise, this book reminds us forcibly of the inevitable limita-

tion and defect of all such writings. For if it took the whole Church in the Nicene Council to define what the Trinity *is*, and even St. Athanasius could confess "although it is impossible to comprehend what God is, yet it is possible to say what He is not," it must take a very clever person to say what this same Trinity *does*; and when we consider that Mr. Eggar regards the Trinity, as a mystery, and proceeds to show how each of its Persons, in themselves mysteries, acts upon the human mind, itself an invisible and startling mystery, it is not surprising if he fails to explain his alleged spiritual phenomena so as to place his thesis above all contradiction. We have never seen the simple Fact of God *proved* by any metaphysician or philosopher. Plato fails in this no more than Kant or Descartes, or Spinoza. We believe in God, because He has been revealed to us, as any child may, and of the inner mystery of God a child may know as much as most folk. And while we receive implicitly the doctrine of the Holy Trinity because Infallible Scripture and the Church affirm it, we have never seen any human explanation or discussion of it entirely (as judged by human intellect) above reproach. The Holy Trinity, whether considered in a life above us, or in those forces working in us, is a matter of infinite mystery and compass; and while we read with thanks all reverent words about this Heart of the Faith, for ourselves, we always leave it as belonging to the realm of Infinite Awfulness veiled in shadows, and repeat, as a child with a simple heart, the ancient Creeds.

THE LIFE OF BISMARCK. *Private and Political. With Descriptive Notes of his Ancestry.* By JOHN GEORGE LOUIS HESEKIEL. Translated by KENNETH R. H. MACKENZIE, F. S. A. *With Upward of One Hundred Illustrations, &c.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. Franklin Square. 1870.

The proof of Bismarck's quality is in the sound of Prussian cannon thundering in mighty but unequal battle against the ancient and warlike empire of the Franks. For it is he and his ideas which, by the confession of Germany herself, has raised Prussia in this age to her great pre-eminency before the world. The history of Prussia is that of a narrow and half-barbaric northern tribe, developed by astute military chieftains into a great military nation, making its sword heavy with the thrift, industry and intelligence of its people, until outmatching more ancient and magnificent Austria, it is bold to try issue of might with that France which aforetime, as at Jena, smote the Brandenbergers bitterly. Bismarck has led up Prussia to this eminency by a diplomatic policy, far-sighted, unscrupulous, lavish of blood and gold, and patient in that preparation which is the very soul of victory. Set down by his friends as outspoken and sincere in statesmanship, it would be nearer the truth, perhaps, to regard him as a man whose excuse before the tribunal of the Future must be, that whatever he has wrought or taken, was not for himself but to exalt and enrich that Prussia to whom he has given, with a great Titanic zeal, his fortunes and his endeavors. It is too soon to ascribe to his policy that crowning virtue of success, as the world counts it; but we at least may say, without contradiction, that it is a policy

which has for years perplexed, and alarmed European diplomacy and has now called all Europe to arms in a struggle whose future no man is wise enough to forecast.

As to this book it is eminently German and Boswellian. To Herr Hesekiel the name of Bismarck is one to conjure with, and he sets his hero on a very lofty pedestal. With true Teutonic plodding he has hunted out all the roots of the Bismarck family in temper which seems to think that if Adam was not a Bismarck he ought to have been one. He goes back behind the cradle, and from that standpoint philosophizes with becoming gravity upon his ancestral honors, his Pomeranian surroundings, his nativity, his babyhood, childhood, young manhood, all in a very minute and ultra Germanic way. Then when his young hero begins to plume himself for higher flights than deer-shooting or a student's duel, our historic master of ceremonies comes forth with a shout into daylight and shows us, as he firmly believes, all the great things of his master's career: how he goes on as minister at Frankfort, St. Petersburg and Paris, and how he speaks in and finally rules the Prussian Parliament with only a minority behind him. His book is unshapely, inorganic and in fragments, and a mock heroic aim and a certain amusing grotesqueness and garrulosity pervade it; but after all, Herr Hesekiel has told us a great many new facts about his hero, and his book has no mean information in it. We gather from it, that Bismarck, born a North German, of an honest, hardy country stock of gentlemen, who lived, rode, fought and died hard, shows his breeding in a robust body, and a stormy, mastering or driving nature, which breaks through a wall that it cannot leap; that he was and is a brave, robust man in mind and body, ready to face rifles, mobs, or even a popular Prussian democracy, without flinching, and that he never swerves from his point; that in politics he does not believe in the people or new-fangled notions of the rights or capacities of the masses, but in the Prussian crown, as the fountain of all might, right and glory to the Prussian people, and that he is only a knight beside the throne to defend it from barricades and ballot boxes, and that in defending his king he defends himself and that mediaeval landed aristocracy to which he belongs and in whose welfare his own fate is held safely; that in diplomacy he aims to make Prussia first, a magnificent German Empire of all Germans, defended by bayonets, wherein peoples are to find their welfare in their obedience to the aristocracy of which the king, by divine right, is head. As for the rest, he appears in these pages as a good husband and parent, a boon companion, and to his friends and those not at war with him, an eminently genial and friendly man. There is nothing of the Greek or Latin about him, but he is a hugely built and stormy-minded Teuton who can press harder than most men against whatever hinders him from his point.

The illustrations in this book are many of them ingenious and interesting; but we cannot refrain from saying, that many more of them, in sympathy with the text, have a grandiloquent and half comical air about them, and impress us as being about as much out of place as would be a series of comic illustrations of the siege of Troy.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN SCUDDER, M. D. *Thirty-six Years Missionary in India.* BY REV. J. B. WATERBURY, D.D. *New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. Franklin Square.* 1870.

We have a friend with us in the country who every August goes to study the habits of spiders and is sadly perplexed to know why God allows the female, when she has laid her eggs, to weave a net for her mate, and thus entangled, to suck his blood. We, on the other hand, are sorely perplexed to know how this book ever came to be written; or being written, ever found a publisher. For certainly the self-sacrificing missionary who buried himself in a foreign land could never have wished this publicity; and there is absolutely nothing in the book itself which ought to save its life. The missionary was a godly man, and he gave his life in a great sacrifice to his Master, which all Christians venerate. But the story is told in such hard, dull, anaesthetic fashion that it is like taking a man's life either to write it or to read it. There are no pictures, pathos, sentiment or beauty in it; and yet below all the brushwood and rubbish of these pages there is a martyr's face, and even these crude and cold words cannot drown the musical voice of a true soul who without doubt was a martyr to his faith. Every missionary's life is interesting, and therefore no story of it can, without crime, be dull. Look at the Life of Dr. Judson, as our defence in the accusing of all this stupid writing.

We will also add, that the religion of Jesus Christ is always full of beauty, gentleness, sweetness and peace. If one would see how completely it can be made something else, at which a healthy Christian soul chokes, let him read pp. 18, 19, giving an account of Dr. Scudder's residing in a certain family where one of its members was converted by "Boston's Fourfold State," rather than by the grace of God; and where an arrow from that book pierced her heart so that she had to go to Christ for Him to draw it out (*sic*).

Dr. Scudder was without doubt a Christian and, as we said, a martyr, but his biographer is not exactly the man to write his life or to lead men to follow his example.

"LIFTING THE VEIL." *Published by Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.*

Diamonds and crystals are both beautiful, but one befits the queen's crown, while the other must be content to keep its own humble rank. If "Gates Ajar" had not been written "Lifting the Veil" might impress us more favorably. We cannot help feeling while reading this book that it is a weak reproduction of the former. The originality and naturalness of the "Gates Ajar" redeem much that might be considered irreverent, while this last story lacks both these charms, and speculates on the chances whether in Heaven "a negro might not need his banjo and bones and a small boy his jew's-harp!" Still we find in it some very interesting conversations and striking thoughts with most comforting assurances *well-supported*, of the recognition of one's friends in Heaven. The chapter on the birth and death of Eleanor's baby is full of pathos, and must appeal to every mother's heart.

But the close similarity in conception and detail to "Gates Ajar" will make

this book always read as an imitation. And as we said before, who will take the better, when one can have the **BEST**? Gold is worth more than gilt.

THE HISTORY OF HORTENSE, DAUGHTER OF JOSEPHINE, QUEEN OF HOLLAND, MOTHER OF NAPOLEON III. *By John S. C. Abbott, author of "The French Revolution," "History of Napoleon Bonaparte," &c. &c.* New York: Harper & Bros. Franklin Sq. 1870.

Gibbon advanced the position that all history is a falsehood. This Mr. Abbott always appears anxious to prove. For in the above book, which by a singular coincidence was laid upon our table about the commencement of the present war between Prussia and the *late* Emperor of France, Mr. Abbott says in his last chapter,

"If Hortense from the spirit-land can look down upon her son, her heart must be cheered in view of the honors which his native land, with such unprecedented unanimity, has conferred upon him. And still more must her heart be cheered in view of the many, many years of peace, prosperity and happiness which France has enjoyed under his reign. Every well informed man will admit that the kingdom of France has never, since its foundations were laid, enjoyed so many years of tranquillity, and of mental and material advancement at home, and also of respect and influence abroad, as during the reign of the son of Hortense."

WONDERS OF THE HUMAN BODY. *From the French of A. Le Pileur, Doctor of Medicines. Illustrated by Forty-Five Engravings.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERS OF GLASS-MAKING IN ALL AGES. *By A. Sauzay. Illustrated with Sixty-Three Engravings on Wood.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

THE SUBLIME IN NATURE. *Compiled from the Descriptions of Travelers and Celebrated Writers. By Ferdinand De Lanoye. With Large Additions.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

THE SUN. *By Amédée Guillemin. From the French. By A. L. Phipson, Ph. D. With Fifty-Eight Illustrations.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

WONDERS OF ITALIAN ART. *By Louis Viardot. Illustrated with Twenty-Eight Engravings.* New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1870.

The list of books just enumerated forms a continuation of Scribner's valuable "Library of Wonders." The plan of such a library is excellent, and has been well executed. There are a great number of scientific and other facts, with which, although formerly locked only in the breasts of savans, in these days of cheap knowledge all our youth should be acquainted. To those desirous of such information, we cannot point out any better works than the above, to aid them in attaining their object. The facts moreover are presented in a pleasing manner, and as profundity is not aimed at, the style is clear, and the explanations and demonstrations easily understood. It is worthy of

remark that all are from the pens of French authors, and this is itself a guarantee of vivacity.

The volume on "Italian Art" contains much excellent reading matter, and that on "The Sun" should be studied by all youth who love astronomy, while the work entitled, "The Human Body," will instruct all classes of readers. These works demonstrate in science what Mr. Abbott fails to do in history—that facts may be made interesting without distortion.

RUBRICS IN THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN LITURGIES, COMPARED. *An Essay read before the Clergy of New Haven County, at Waterbury, Conn., November 3d, 1869.* By E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY.

DR. WILLIAM SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. *Revised and Edited by Prof. H. B. HACKETT, D. D. With the co-operation of EZRA ABBOTT, LL.D.* New York: *Hurd & Houghton.* 1869. *Part XXII.*

MY ENEMY'S DAUGHTER. *A Novel.* By JUSTIN McCARTHY. *Author of "The Waterdale Neighbors," etc.* Illustrated. New York: *Harper and Brothers.* 1869.

HEGEL'S FIRST PRINCIPLES. *An Exposition of Comprehension and Idea (Begriff und Idee).* Translated from the German of G. W. F. Hegel. And accompanied with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes. By WM. F. HARRIS. New York: *John Wiley & Sons.*

BOUND TO JOHN COWPANY: *Or the Adventures and Misadventures of Robert Ansleigh.* With Illustrations. New York: *Harper & Brothers.* 1869.

THE PASTORAL WORK: *Or Sowing and Reaping.* The Thirtieth Anniversary of the Rectorship of the Rev. Samuel M. Haskins, D. D., of St. Mark's Church, Williamsburgh. Commemorated on the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity. 1869. New York: *Slate & Janes.*

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF YALE COLLEGE. 1869-70.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF TRINITY COLLEGE, 1869-70. Hartford Church Press Co. 1870.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, May, 1870. Leonard Scott Publishing Company. New York.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. CLXXXIII. January, April and July, 1870. American Edition. New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street.

In the first of these numbers is a venture of an assault against Christianity, unexampled, we believe, in the history of Infidelity. The fashion of the age has been to extol the moral system of our Holy Religion, while deriding its supernatural attestation. But in an Article from the *Westminster*, an argument against its truth is deduced from its purity. The writer asks: "Is prostitution, after all, notwithstanding the teachings of Jesus and Paul, and the long-cherished belief of the Christian world in the righteous-

ness of what we have called Christian purism, an indispensable part of every considerable aggregation of human beings? And if so, what shall we say of Christianity which with an alleged supernatural sanction teaches us an exactly opposite doctrine?" If this objection against the Scriptures be valid, we suppose the Commandment should stand—"Thou *shalt* commit adultery."

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, No. CCLXVII. January and July, 1870. American Edition. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, No. 140 Fulton Street, New York.

These numbers have many valuable articles. That entitled "John Calvin in Church and State," presents a most impartial and interesting estimate of that eminent Divine, at once illustrious for the narrowness of his theology, the severity of his nature, and the brilliancy of his genius. His impress on Presbyterianism is like that of Wesley on Methodism. Hence the difference between the individuality of a human organization, and the Catholicity of a Divine Institution.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, No. CCLV. January and April, 1870. American Edition. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, New York.

THE NEW ENGLANDER. *Edited by* PROF. GEORGE P. FISHER, PROF. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, and WM. L. KINGSLEY. JULY, 1870, NEW HAVEN, STAFFORD PRINTING CO.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW. *Edited by* CHARLES HODGE, D.D., LYMAN W. ATWATER, D.D., *with the special co-operation of* REV. M. A. JACOBUS, D.D., REV. WM. HENRY GREEN, D.D., REV. EDWIN HALL, D.D., *President* C. A. AIKEN, REV. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D. and REV. WM. M. BLACKBURN. 1870. New York, CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO., 654 Broadway.

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, July, 1870. *Editor*, W. T. MOORE, *Associate Editors*, W. K. PENDLETON, ISAAC ERRETT, ROBERT GRAHAM, DR. S. E. SHEPHERD, THOMAS NUNNELL, ALEXANDER PROCTER. Cincinnati, R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers, 116 and 117 West Fourth Street.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, LITTELL & GAY, Broomfield St., Boston.

THE JOURNAL OF SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY, July, 1870. WILLIAM T. DAVIS, St. Louis, Mo.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND ARTS. *Conducted by* Professors B. SILLIMAN and JAMES D. DANA, *in connection with* Profs. ASA GRAY and WOLCOTT GIBBS of Cambridge, and Profs. H. A. NEWTON, and W. JOHNSON, GEO. I. BRUSH and A. E. VERRILL of New Haven. Second Series. July and September. Vol. XLIX. New Haven, TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE & TAYLOR.

THE CHURCH REGISTER. September, 1870. Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE & MONTHLY REVIEW. September, 1870.
T. & R. WHITE, Hamilton, Ontario.

THE SPIRIT OF MISSIONS. September, 1870. Nos. 17 & 19 Bible House,
New York.

THE COLONIAL CHURCH CHRONICLE AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL, AND
FOREIGN ECCLESIASTICAL REPORTER. August, 1870. W. H. BARTLETT
& Co., 186 Fleet St. London

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MISSIONARY REGISTER. No. 3 Bible House,
New York.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. 27 Bible House, New York.

THE PEOPLE'S MAGAZINE. July, 1870. London Society for Promoting
Christian Knowledge, 77 Great Queen St. New York, POTT & AMERY,
5 and 13 Cooper Union.

There is probably no magazine published in the world, which more perfectly combines beauty of illustration and excellence of matter. It is equally suited to amuse the young and profit the old.

DIOCESSE OF LONG ISLAND. Bishop Littlejohn's Primary Charge and Address, 1869.

JOURNAL OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH CONVENTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH in the Diocese of New York.

JOURNAL OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Diocese of Western New York. 1869.

JOURNAL OF THE FIFTIETH ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Diocese of Maine. 1869.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, Chicago, 1869.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HOME FOR INCURABLES. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, 113 Fulton Street.

THE SABBATH HYMN AND TUNE BOOK. Hamersly & Co., Hartford, Conn.

THE HOUSE OF REST FOR CONSUMPTIVES. The Rev. Horatio Potter, D. D., LL.D., D.C.L., President *ex-officio*. Henry J. Cammann, President. 8 Wall Street, New York.

D. APPLETON & Co.'s Monthly Bulletin of New Publications. 90, 92, and 94 Grand Street, New York.

THE BOOK BUYER. A Summary of American and Foreign Literature. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.

STEIGER'S LITERARISCHER MONATSVERIGT. 22 and 24 Frankfort Street, New York.

WOOD'S HOUSEHOLD MAGAZINE. S. S. Wood, Newburgh, New York.

SOUND WORDS. March, 1870. 44 Bible House, New York.

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, 1868-69.

FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH ANNUAL REPORTS OF ST. LUKE'S FREE HOSPITAL. 1866, 69. Chicago.

A REMINISCENCE OF SLEEPY HOLLOW. By the Rev. Edmund Guilbert, M.A. BIBLE SOCIETY RECORD. Bible House, New York.

WESTERN INSURANCE REVIEW. St. Louis, January, 1870.

VICK'S ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE, AND FLORAL GUIDE. 1870. Rochester, N. Y.

REGISTER OF RACINE COLLEGE. Racine, Wisconsin, for the Academical Year 1869-70. Milwaukee: Banks & Burdick, Church Printers.

THE CLOISTER AND THE HEARTH. By Charles Reade. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

ONLY HERSELF. A Novel. By Annie Thomas. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

HIRELL: A Novel. By the author of "Abel Drake's Wife," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

SO RUNS THE WORLD AWAY: A Novel. By Mrs. A. C. Steele. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

UNDER FOOT: A Novel. By Alton Clyde. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

THE RULE OF THE MONK: Or, Rome in the Nineteenth Century. By General Garibaldi. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

AN APPEAL FOR THE COMPLETION OF CHRIST CHURCH, and the Building of the New Schools. By Rev. T. S. Cartwright. Hamilton, Ontario.

CHURCH PAPERS: Or, Tracts for the People. Nos. 1 and 2. Toronto.

THE BIBLE AND THE COMMON SCHOOLS: Or, The Question Settled. By the Author of "The Church, Rome, and Dissent." Detroit: John H. Caine & Co. New York: Pott & Amery, E. P. Dutton & Co. Chicago: Mitchell & Clark. And all Booksellers East and West.

THE END OF THE WORLD, AND THE DAY OF JUDGMENT. Rev. William Rounseville Alger. Boston: Roberts & Brothers. 1870.

THE NOTICE BOOK: Consisting of Blanks for Clergymen and Choirs. Published by the Rev. N. Pettit. Bordentown, N. J. 1870.

NOT DISCERNING THE LORD'S BODY. By the REV. BENJAMIN B. GRISWOLD, M.A., Rector of Trinity School, Baltimore, and Presbyter in charge of the Chapel of the Holy Cross. Baltimore, GEORGE LYCETT, 35 St. Charles St. 1870.

LAY PREACHING. Sermon by the REV. WAYLAND HOYT, 530 Arch St. Philadelphia.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. For Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany. 1869-70. Fenton, Mich.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MIDNIGHT MISSION, 1869-70. New York.

TRINITY PARISH, NEW YORK. Free Chapel of St. Augustine, 262 and 264 Bowery. Sermon preached at the opening of the Chapel for Divine Service on the 4th Sunday in Advent. By the REV. MORGAN DIX, S.T.D. 1870.

THE NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY. Depository, Cooper Union, Fourth Avenue, 1869.

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING of the Society for the increase of the Ministry, and the Board of Directors. Held in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, and the Church of the Holy Communion, New York, October 10th and 12th, 1869. Hartford, Church Press Company.

HOME AND ABROAD, Domestic and Foreign Missions, Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, September 15th, 1870. American Church Press Co. 111 East Ninth St., N. Y.

We are pleased to welcome every number of this new missionary monthly. Both its appearance, and its contributions will satisfy the expectation of the Church. Its circulation we hope will soon reach one hundred thousand. We predict that it will be a most valuable, and successful Agency in educating the Church for its vast work in our own country, and throughout the world.

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY. July, 1870. Philadelphia, 530 Arch Street.

THE TECHNOLOGIST. Especially devoted to Engineering, Manufacturing and Building, May, 1870. Industrial Publication Co. 176 Broadway, N. Y.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM. A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly. Nashville, Tenn., July, 1870.

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CATALOGUE of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y., 1869-70. Albany, J. Munsell, 82 State St.

THE ECLECTIC MAGAZINE OF FOREIGN LITERATURE. W. H. BIDWELL, Editor, E. R. Pelton, Publisher, 108 Fulton St., N. Y.

THE ART REVIEW. Chicago, E. H. Trafton, No. 115 Madison St. April, 1870.

LIBRARY OF EDUCATION. The Bible in the Public Schools. New York, J. W. Schermerhorn & Co., 14 Bond St.

REVOLUTION, OR NO? Four Sermons preached in Trinity Church, Pottsville. By Rev. William P. Lewis, Rector. Philadelphia, Richard Mc Cauley, Publisher, 1314 Chestnut St., 1870.

DIOCESE OF LONG ISLAND. Journal of the Second Convention, 1869.

HISTORICAL DISCOURSE. Delivered at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of Christ Church, St. Louis, on All Saints' Day, 1869. By the Rev. Mont-

gomery Schuyler, D.D. St. Louis, Mo. Printed by George Knapp & Co., 1870.

THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL WORKER. J. W. McIntyre, No. 4 South Fifth St., St. Louis.

TRADE CIRCULAR AND LITERARY BULLETIN. New York, Leypoldt and Holt, 451 Broome St., 1870.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME FOR LENT, HOLY WEEK, AND EASTER. 1870. Lenton, Mich. Osgood E. Fuller. Detroit, John H. Caine & Co.

THE AMERICAN CATALOGUE OF BOOKS FOR 1869. New York. Leypoldt & Holt, 451 Broome St. 1870.

THE CHOIR. A JOURNAL OF MUSIC. 4 Crane Court, Fleet St., E. C., April 9th, 1870.

THE NATION: THE FOUNDATIONS OF CIVIL ORDER AND POLITICAL LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES. By E. MULFORD. Hurd & Houghton, Riverside Press. 1870.

THE NEW YORK TEACHER AND AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY, April, 1870. J. H. Schermerhorn & Co., 14 Bond St., New York.

OUR WARDENS AND VESTRYMEN. By O. S. BARTEN, D.D., Christ Church, Norfolk. 1870.

HAND-BOOK OF THE SULPHUR-CURE. By WILLIAM I. FLAGG, Author of "Three Seasons in European Vineyards." New York, Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

CATALOGUE FOR PASTOR'S LIBRARY. Prepared by Professors at Andover, New Haven, and Chicago. Andover, Warren F. Draper, Main St. 1870.

OHIO VALLEY HISTORICAL SERIES. Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati. 1869.

RECORD OF CHRISTIAN WORK. Philadelphia, April, 1870.

NEW CYCLOPEDIA OF ILLUSTRATIONS. By REV. ELON FOSTER. New York. W. C. Palmer & Co., 14 Bible House, Astor Place.

THE LITTLE CORPORAL. May, 1870. Sewell & Miller, Chicago, Ill.

HOURS AT HOME. New York. Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. June, 1870.

RIVERSIDE MAGAZINE, for Young People, June, 1870. Hurd & Houghton.

HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE. June, 1870. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, New York.

BAFFLED. By JULIA GODDARD. Illustrated. New York. Harper & Bros., Franklin Square. 1870.

A BRAVE LADY. By the Author of "John Halifax Gentleman," "A Life

for a Life," &c. New York. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

DEBENHAM'S VOW. By AMELIA B. EDWARDS. Illustrated. New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

TOM BROWN'S SCHOOL DAYS. By An Old Boy. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1870.

MISS VAN KORTLAND. By the Author of "My Daughter ELINOR." New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

BENEATH THE WHEELS. By the Author of "Olive Vancoe," &c. New York. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, No. CIV. July, 1870. American Edition. New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street.

BEECHER'S MAGAZINE. Published by J. A. Beecher, Trenton, New Jersey. American News Company, Agents, 117, 121 Nassau Street, New York.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE. September, 1870.

OLD AND NEW. July, 1870. Boston: Roberts & Brothers, 143 Washington Street. London: Sampson, Low, Son & Marston. 1870.

THE TECHNOLOGIST. June, July and August, 1870. Especially devoted to Engineering, Manufacturing, and Building. 176 Broadway, New York.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, New York. July, 1870.

HOURS AT HOME. A Popular Monthly of Instruction and Recreation. August, 1870. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.

DIOCESE OF MARYLAND. Journal of the Eighty-Seventh Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF EASTON. Journal of the Second Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF VERMONT. Journal of the Eightieth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF GEORGIA. Journal of the Forty-Eighth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF OHIO. Journal of the Fifty-Third Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF CONNECTICUT. Journal of the Eighty-Sixth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF RHODE ISLAND. Journal of the Eightieth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF MISSOURI. Journal of the Thirtieth Annual Convention, 1870.

DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS. Journal of the Eightieth Annual Convention, 1870.

THE BALTIMORE UNDERWRITER. Baltimore, August, 1870. No. 3 Post Office Avenue.

THE TRADE CIRCULAR AND LITERARY BULLETIN. Leypoldt & Holt, No. 25 Bond St., New York. 1870.

THE MANUFACTURER AND BUILDER. September, 1870. American News Company, 121 Nassau St., New York.

AN OFFERING OF LOVE TO THE REV. WILLIAM LUPTON JOHNSON, D.D. By one of the many who loved him, 1870.

THE DE VEAUX COLLEGE REGISTER. Fourteenth Year, 1870.

BROTHERHOOD AND SISTERHOOD OF SYRACUSE, 1870.

THE CHURCH A WITNESS. The Sermon before the American Church Union. Preached in Trinity Chapel, New York, at the Annual Meeting, April 28th, 1870. By Thomas A. Starkey, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C.

DISSENTING REASON FOR JOINING THE CHURCH. Sixth Edition, with Additions.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY on the Announcement of the Death of Thomas J. Bryan, June, 1870.

THE RIVERSIDE MAGAZINE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, September, 1870. Hurd & Houghton, No. 13 Astor Place, New York.

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Board of Managers of the Protestant Episcopal Church Missionary Society in the City and Port of New York, 1870.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. A Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. O. T. Porcher. Abbeville, S. C. 1870. By Rev. U. P. Du Bose, 1870. Walker, Evans & Cogswell. Charleston.

IS THE WESTERN CHURCH UNDER ANATHEMA? A Problem for the Ecumenical Council of 1869. By Edmund S. Ffoulkes, B.D. Third Thousand. London. J. T. Hayes, Lyall Place, Eaton Square. New York: Pott & Amery.

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN GEOLOGICAL AND STATISTICAL SOCIETY, 1870. Vol. II. Part II. Edited by the Recording Secretary.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY. May 12th, 1870. New York.

YALE COLLEGE IN 1870.

THE WEEKLY COMMUNIONS AND CHURCH ORDINANCES. A Sermon preached at Venice, October 24th, 1869. By the Rev. John Davies Merreweather, B.A., Oxon, Chaplain. London, 1870. Rivington's, Waterloo Place, High Street, Oxford. Trinity Street, Cambridge.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS UNION. By the Rev. John Davies Merreweather, B.D., Oxon, English Chaplain at Venice. Bristol, 1870.

PREPARATION FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION. The Devotions chiefly compiled from the works of Bishop Taylor. By Miss Sewell. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway. 1870.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF THE NASHOTAH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. 1869-70. Milwaukee. Hawks & Burdick, Church Printers. 1870.

AN OFFERING OF LOVE TO OLD ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, Hoboken. 1870.

HANDMAIDENS OF THE LORD. A Sermon preached in Christ Church, Poughkeepsie. June 16th, 1870. On the occasion of the Commencement of Cottage Hill Seminary. By the Rev. Benjamin H. Paddock, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, Brooklyn Heights.

D. APPLETON & CO.'S Monthly Bulletin of New Publications. New York, Sept. 1, 1870. 90, 92, and 94 Grand St.

AN ORATION delivered before the Wesleyan Academy Alumni Association, at Wilbraham, Mass. June 29th, 1870. By Damon Y. Kilgore, Esq., of Philadelphia.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE. By Rev. Hugh Ray Scott. Baltimore, 1870. Geo. Lycett, No. 44 Lexington St.

STEIGER'S LITERARISCHER MONATSVEREICH. E. Steiger, Verleger und Buchdrucker, 22 and 24 Frankfort Street, New York.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. September, 1870. No. 27 Bible House.

THE LITTLE CORPORAL. September, 1870. Sewell & Miller, Chicago, Ill.
REGISTER OF THE BISHOP SEABURY MISSION. 1870.

THE UNITED STATES INTERNAL REVENUE AND TARIFF LAW. Passed July 13th, 1870. Compiled by Horace E. Dresser. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1870.

LECTURE INTRODUCTORY TO THE COURSE on Materia Medica and Hygiene. Delivered before the Medical Class of the University of Buffalo, November 28th, 1869. By Charles A. Lee, M. D. Buffalo: Published by the request of the Class.

KILMENY. By William Black, Author of "In Silk Attire," "Love or Marriage?" etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

GWENDOLINE'S HARVEST: A Novel. By the author of "Carlyon's Year," "One of the Family," "A Beggar on Horseback," "Found Dead," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1870.

ADDENDUM.

A very large number of Books, Sermons and Pamphlets have been placed on the table of the Editor. He has found it impossible to notice them in this issue of the REVIEW as they deserve. They are therefore postponed until January, and as the number of that month concludes the magazine year, it is proposed to devote an unusual space to the review of Books.

ERRATUM.—On page 333 for "Cardinal," read "Archbishop."